

executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27, 1902.

POSTMASTERS.

Melville Sheridan, to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Clarke and State of Iowa, in place of Melville Sheridan. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Wallace M. Moore, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa, in place of Wallace M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1902.

George L. Wilkinson, to be postmaster at Neola, in the county of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa, in place of George L. Wilkinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1902.

William L. Buford, to be postmaster at Nicholasville, in the county of Jessamine and State of Kentucky, in place of William L. Buford. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1902.

Nathan H. Sears, to be postmaster at Millbury, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of Nathan H. Sears. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1902.

Charles B. Collingwood, to be postmaster at Agricultural College, in the county of Ingham and State of Michigan, in place of Ira H. Butterfield. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

John E. Crawford, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan, in place of John E. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1902.

George W. Buswell, to be postmaster at Blue Earth, late Blue Earth City, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, in place of George W. Buswell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Samuel Y. Gordon, jr., to be postmaster at Brown Valley, in the county of Traverse and State of Minnesota, in place of Samuel Y. Gordon, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1902.

Lemmon G. Beebe, to be postmaster at Winnebago City, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, in place of Lemmon G. Beebe. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Jonas W. Mullen, to be postmaster at Charlotte, in the county of Mecklenburg and State of North Carolina, in place of Jonas W. Mullen. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Richard Daeley, to be postmaster at Devils Lake, in the county of Ramsey and State of North Dakota, in place of Richard Daeley. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1902.

Thomas J. Davies, to be postmaster at Barberton, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in place of George A. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1902.

Charles W. Searls, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio, in place of Charles W. Searls. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1902.

David M. Graham, to be postmaster at Mahanoy City, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Frank F. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1902.

Henry S. Williams, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Brown and State of South Dakota, in place of Samuel H. Jumper. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1902.

Joseph L. Crupper, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Alexandria and State of Virginia, in place of Joseph L. Crupper. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

John McDuffie, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi, in place of Katie Edwards, removed.

Herbert C. Hurd, to be postmaster at Rugby, in the county of Pierce and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential July 1, 1901.

Horatio S. Whetsell, to be postmaster at Kingwood, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1902.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John H. Bauman, of Arizona, to be receiver of public moneys at Tucson, Ariz.

POSTMASTER.

Jacob M. Alexander, to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Terrell and State of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 27, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved. Mr. HULL obtained the floor and said: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself in Committee of the Whole—

PURCHASE OF DANISH WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I present the resolution which I hold in my hand and now send to the desk, and which I ask to have read, as it states the matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas one Walter Christmas, a subject of Denmark, who is now and who has been for several years a diplomatic agent and representative of the Government of Denmark, authorized and empowered to negotiate with the Government of the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, and who was also the agent of the United States for the purchase of said islands, has submitted a secret and confidential report to his own Government; and

Whereas the said Christmas, agent and representative as aforesaid, in his said report to his said Government, declares and sets forth, among other things, the fact that the Government of Denmark has contracted, agreed, and obligated itself to pay and turn over to him, the said Christmas, 10 per cent, or about \$500,000, of the proceeds of the purchase money arising from the sale of said islands to the United States when the same shall have been paid by the United States to Denmark, for the express purpose, as has been declared and set forth by him in his said secret report to his Government, for the bribing of members of the United States Congress and other prominent citizens of this country and for subsidizing American newspapers, to the end that the pending treaty between the United States and Denmark for the sale of the islands by the latter to the former Government may be so consummated; and

Whereas it is also declared and expressly set forth in said secret report that if said purchase money shall be paid to Denmark by the United States the said sum of about \$500,000 thereof will be immediately paid over to said Christmas, agent and representative of the aforesaid, by his Government in pursuance of the agreement and contract already referred to for the corrupt objects and purposes set forth; and

Whereas the treaty between the two said Governments for the sale of the West Indian Islands by Denmark to the United States is now pending, and its ratification has not been finally consummated by the two said Governments, and the purchase price for the islands has not been appropriated by Congress; Therefore

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That a select committee of seven members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker, whose duty it shall be to examine into the truth of all the allegations and charges made by the said Walter Christmas, agent and representative as aforesaid, in his said secret and confidential report to the Danish Government as to the methods pursued and to be pursued by him and any of his assistants in the United States, and the contracts made or proposed to be made by him or other persons acting in any way for him, or as assistants to him, for the purpose of, or which in any manner has for their object the bribery of or the attempted bribery of members of the United States Congress or of the payment of any valuable consideration of any kind or character to them or to any of them to vote for or to assist in procuring the proposal, adoption, or ratification of the said treaty of sale of the said islands, as aforesaid. Said committee shall have power to subpoena and examine witnesses under oath and to send for records, papers, and all other evidence that may be necessary for a full and complete investigation of the subjects herein mentioned, and it shall be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and to have such printing and binding done as it shall deem necessary. The committee shall make a full report to the House of the result of its investigation at as early a date as is practicable. The expense of the investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that. The preamble recites that the information it contained in a secret report, or, in other words, the preamble itself recites the fact that there are no facts known to the author of it—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. A little louder. I can not hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. PAYNE. The preamble recites that this is based on a secret report, or, in other words, it states facts of a secret report. Now, it seems to me that contradicts itself; that there is no foundation to form a question of privilege upon such a report, and the second point is that that matter is not before the House of Representatives.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to that that it is not such a question of privilege that would take me off the floor for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Upon the latter point the Chair is clear that it would take the gentleman from the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York, I hope I will be permitted to say that that resolution which I have introduced alleges that these charges have been made by a diplomatic agent of the Danish Government to his Government in a secret report. I desire to say that I have on my desk a copy of that secret report, and therefore the objection made by the gentleman is not tenable. It was a secret report when made, and is described as a secret report by me in the resolution; but I state upon my honor as a member of this House that I have what purports to be and what I believe, from the evidence which I have before me and which I propose now to offer to the Speaker and to the House and to the country,

to be the report, less one page, made by this secret agent to the Danish Government.

Now, I say that, Mr. Speaker, with a full responsibility of the words. I state as a member of this House that I have the unmistakable evidences in my judgment that this report was made by Mr. Christmas, the agent of the Danish Government and a quasi, if not a real, agent of our own Government, to Denmark. Having the copy of the report which I purpose offering here as a part of my remarks and from which I now desire to read, it seems to me that the objection made by the gentleman from New York will not hold.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman when he examined the archives of the Government of Denmark to see this secret report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Ah, Mr. Speaker, I have never been to Denmark and have never examined the archives of that Government, but that is not the only way in which we can get evidence of the genuineness of a report. I take it the gentleman has never examined any of the archives of the courts of Europe, and yet he must believe that reports that have been made there are genuine. It is not necessary that I should go to Denmark. I have the evidences, Mr. Speaker, and I desire now to submit some of those evidences to the Chair, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this is a grave charge. I have not brought it here for the purpose of seeking a mere political advantage. Here is a charge made by an official of the Danish Government that he has \$500,000, or will have, of the purchase money to be paid, and which has not yet been paid, by this Government, for the express purpose of bribing American Congressmen, and yet the gentleman from New York endeavors to interpose a technical objection. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have evidences to sustain me in the statement which I have made upon my honor, and which I believe to be true. Now, sir, I am content to have the Chair rule upon the statement as made, or I will submit cheerfully some of the evidences which I hold in my hand and which are in my possession as to the genuineness of this report. Mr. Speaker, shall I proceed with some of the evidences as to the genuineness of the report or the authenticity of the report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has covered that branch of the case by making the statement here upon his honor.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I believe it, sir; but I would prefer to give some of the evidences in order that the gentleman may see that I am not exaggerating, that I am not straining my conscience at all in making that statement, because I think the evidences which I possess are conclusive of the fact, and that every gentleman on the floor of this House who hears these evidences will believe that the report is genuine.

Mr. Speaker, I state that it has been published largely in nearly all of the papers in Copenhagen. I have some of the Copenhagen papers here containing this report, or portions of it. I have had them translated. I have the translations from these papers, and I am ready to submit the original papers to any Danish scholar who may read them, and I will also submit and have published with my remarks these extracts from the Danish papers. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is true—

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the allegations are that the members of Congress have been corrupted and bribed; also the newspapers. With regard to the newspapers, the Chair thinks that is a matter which alone would be hardly within the jurisdiction of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That may be subject to the criticism made, I admit.

The SPEAKER. And the term "Congress" includes both House and Senate. The allegations are not so specific as to show whether any member of the House is included in the charge. In respect to this the Chair is very strongly of the opinion that that body must be the custodian of its own morals, and no specification is made here which directly affects the House, as the Chair remembers the resolution when read, although the general term would include both Houses. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman on that point.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; I am prepared on that. The resolution as I present it describes the persons to be bribed as "members of Congress." I am warranted in amending the resolution, if the Chair holds that it is necessary, so as to say that the charge includes members of this House; but, Mr. Speaker, that is unnecessary. If we, the representatives of the American people, are to appropriate the money, if this treaty has been procured by bribery of American Senators and members were not included, we would have a right to inquire as to the truth of these charges.

Therefore that objection is immaterial; but I would be warranted in amending the resolution so as to limit it alone to members of this House, if that is required, and the Chair should hold that it must be members of the House of Representatives who are

charged and should exclude all charges as to Senators. And I am very clearly of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that inasmuch as the treaty has not been ratified, and inasmuch as the question must come here for an appropriation, that we have the right, as the representatives of the American people, to know whether or not that treaty has been procured by bribery, whether \$500,000, or any portion of this money, when paid over to Denmark, is to be distributed in this country to members of either House of Congress in furthering this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is pretty strongly of the opinion that this should be limited to the House. If the gentleman will make that amendment—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Very well, Mr. Speaker. In my resolution, where I use the word "Congress," I will insert "including members of the House of Representatives."

Mr. FLEMING. Including members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire that the resolution be sent to me in order that I may add the words "including members of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. That will be the proper form.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. All right; I will make that addition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope we may have order; but if gentlemen do not want to hear this it is immaterial to me.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have added, after the words "members of the United States Congress," the words "including members of the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution as amended in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas one Walter Christmas, a subject of Denmark, who is now and who has been for several years a diplomatic agent and representative of the Government of Denmark, authorized and empowered to negotiate with the Government of the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, and who was also the agent of the United States for the purchase of said islands, has submitted a secret and confidential report to his own Government; and

Whereas the said Christmas, agent and representative as aforesaid, in his said report to his said Government, declares and sets forth among other things the fact that the Government of Denmark has contracted, agreed, and obligated itself to pay and turn over to him, the said Christmas, 10 per cent, or about \$500,000, of the proceeds of the purchase money arising from the sale of said islands to the United States when the same shall have been paid by the United States to Denmark for the express purpose, as has been declared and set forth by him in his said secret report to his Government, for the bribing of members of the United States Congress, including members of the House of Representatives, and other prominent citizens of this country, and for subsidizing American newspapers, to the end that the pending treaty between the United States and Denmark for the sale of the islands by the latter to the former Government may be so consummated; and

Whereas it is also declared and expressly set forth in said secret report, that if said purchase money shall be paid to Denmark by the United States, the said sum of about \$500,000 will be immediately paid over to said Christmas, agent and representative of the aforesaid, by his Government in pursuance of the agreement and contract already referred to, for the corrupt objects and purposes set forth; and

Whereas the treaty between the two said Governments for the sale of the West Indian Islands by Denmark to the United States is now pending, and its ratification has not been finally consummated by the two said Governments, and the purchase price for the islands has not been appropriated by Congress: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That a select committee of 7 members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker, whose duty it shall be to examine into the truth of all the allegations and charges made by the said Walter Christmas, agent and representative as aforesaid, in his said secret and confidential report to the Danish Government, as to the methods pursued and to be pursued by him and any of his assistants in the United States, and the contracts made or proposed to be made by him or other persons acting in any way for him, or as assistants to him for the purpose of, or which in any manner had for their object the bribery of or the attempted bribery of members of the United States Congress or of the payment of any valuable consideration of any kind or character to them or to any of them to vote for or to assist in procuring the proposal, adoption, or ratification of the said treaty of sale of the said islands, as aforesaid.

Said committee shall have power to subpoena and examine witnesses, under oath, and to send for records, papers, and all other evidence that may be necessary for a full and complete investigation of the subjects herein mentioned, and it shall be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, and to have such printing and binding done as it shall be necessary. The committee shall make a full report to the House of the result of its investigation at as early a date as is practicable. The expenses of the investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say, on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], that it is clear, especially as the matter has been amended at the suggestion of the Chair, that this is a matter of high privilege. It has troubled the Chair somewhat to decide how much we should be governed by the statements made by a member of a foreign Government, but the gentleman from Tennessee, having stated on his honor as a member of the House that he believes in the integrity of these charges that have been made—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No; I beg pardon. I do not mean—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state it. Not that the gentleman vouches for the charges being true, but for the fact that this

officer of a foreign Government made the statement, practically brings it in as his own charge.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let me ask pardon of the Chair. I have not stated that these charges are true. I have stated that I believe this report is genuine and that Mr. Christmas, the agent of the Danish Government, has made the charges that are contained in it. I do not say the charges are true.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee clearly vouches for the authenticity of the charges, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That they have been made.

The SPEAKER. In that view of the case, the Chair is clearly of the opinion that the point of order is not well taken, and recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first proof which I desire to offer, and which leads me to believe that these charges have been made in this report, is in the shape of an affidavit made by a man who was formerly a subject of Denmark, who was born in Denmark, educated at Harvard University, and who is now a citizen of the United States. He has made an affidavit, which I will now read:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Washington City:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned, Niels Gron, and made oath in due form of law that he is a native of Denmark, but now a citizen of the United States; that he was in Copenhagen, Denmark, from the 7th day of December, 1901, to the 15th day of February, 1902. That he arrived in the United States, returning from Denmark, on the 26th day of February, 1902, and came at once to Washington City; that he brought with him a copy of the special and confidential report made by Walter Christmas to the Danish Government of date October 1, 1900, less one page thereof, which is missing from the report; that a large part of said report has been published in many of the newspapers of Denmark, and that he himself translated said report into English and delivered a copy thereof to Hon. JAMES D. RICHARDSON, M. C., within the last week; that he knows the said Walter Christmas personally, and that said Christmas, has admitted, in a statement over his own signature, which statement has been published in the newspapers of Copenhagen, that the copy of the report as published in the Danish papers is a correct copy. He further makes oath that he has faithfully translated extracts from Copenhagen newspapers commenting on said report as they appeared in said papers from about February 1, 1902, to a late date, and that he has also delivered said extracts, with the newspapers from which they were taken, to said RICHARDSON.

NIELS GRON.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this March 27, 1902.

[L. S.]

AARON RUSSELL, Notary Public.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The same gentleman who makes this affidavit, Mr. Gron, this morning handed me the following statement:

When early in February last the contents of Mr. Walter Christmas's secret report to the Danish Government, relative to the transfer of the Danish West India Islands to the United States, became public, a party comprising a large portion of Denmark's best and most influential men and highest interests, realizing that since Christmas had, in the furtherance of the pending treaty, served by direct authority first the Secretary of State of the United States and afterwards the Danish prime minister, Mr. Horning, it would be impossible to disassociate his efforts from the treaty or the methods set forth in his report from the official negotiation.

And realizing, further, that if the present treaty was consummated and permitted to take effect Denmark would be obliged to stand before the world as having made use of and the United States as having accepted such negotiations as said Christmas sets forth and describes in the above-mentioned report; and since it was thought that that would place the people of the two nations in an unfavorable and regrettable light, I was requested by the party referred to to journey with all speed from Copenhagen to Washington and lay before the representatives of the people of the United States the facts touching certain parts of the negotiations, in order that any further steps taken by the United States toward causing the taking effect of the treaty in question might be done with a full knowledge of the situation.

NIELS GRON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1902.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands the extracts which this American citizen, Mr. Gron, says he has translated from Danish papers, and some of these extracts I shall read. I have the papers on my desk, and any Danish scholar who desires to do so can have that pleasure, if it be a pleasure to him, to read them. The first article is headed:

LEAVES OF DANISH DEGRADATION.

This paper says:

At the second reading of the finance bill—

In the Parliament or Congress of Denmark—

it was argued as a proof that our ministers to foreign countries are of no value, that Mr. Brun, in Washington—

Mr. Brun, I may add, is the official representative of the Danish Government in Washington—

had had nothing to do with the sale of the West Indies. Prime Minister Deuntzer contradicted this, and said that the negotiations could not have been carried on without Minister Brun's assistance. Captain Christmas will certainly think differently. It is a fact that it was he who got the American Government to begin the negotiations. It was he who brought the American Government's envoy, Mr. White, to the Danish foreign ministry in Copenhagen, and it was he who got the mission again in January, 1900, to go to America, where, according to Mr. White's statement, he was persona grata. Mr. Christmas claims that he has had no assistance from the Danish minister in Washington, Mr. Brun.

It appears even from his report that he thinks himself directly opposed by the minister. Before his departure Captain Christmas had expressed to Prime Minister Horning that he feared antagonism from Minister Brun. Mr. Horning then promised him that he would write to the minister and inform him of Christmas's mission. Nevertheless, Christmas thinks he has noticed

cold rays from the minister in Washington. While Christmas under his first visit had found open doors and cordial receptions, he now noticed a strong turn in the situation. A part of the press turned against him and wrote uncomplimentary about him, especially was diligent use made of the fact that he had been dismissed from the Danish Navy in disgrace. Mr. Christmas had anticipated that, and on that account had made every effort to get the judgment removed.

The Government had not been entirely unwilling to listen to this, but thought that the actual removal of the judgment should be the final reward when the sale should be accomplished through Mr. Christmas's efforts. The Danish Government in that has without doubt acted very unwisely. Either Mr. Christmas was a man whom the Government could not use, and then it should have nothing to do with him, or else it had confidence in him and his ability, in which case it was its duty to assist him and in every way prevent difficulties. Mr. Christmas went to Senator LODGE, a man who it was not possible to bribe, and requested his advice. Mr. LODGE advised him to go to the foreign minister, Mr. Hay, and tell him how the matter stood. He followed the suggestion. Hay was surprised that Christmas did not receive greater assistance from the Danish side, and he was angry over Rodger's machinations.

The ground in Washington became too warm for Christmas, and he moved to New York. For the benefit of the sales project Christmas had secured the assistance of two press associations, and he had contracts with a C. W. Knox, friend of Senator MARK HANNA, of Ohio, and Mr. Richard P. Evans, a lawyer in Washington, who represented Senator HANNA.

These connections quite naturally made certain demands. Already this to bribe politicians and buy journalists on credit was in itself a difficult matter, and Christmas had nothing else to offer as guaranty than his own promises. He was obliged, however, in several cases to furnish the cash. Where did he get it from? He had nothing himself, and the 6,000 kr. for expenses would reach nowhere for such use. He must have had connections in Denmark.

Mr. Christmas insisted upon getting his banking firm, Seligman, in New York, recognized. For this he claims to have had the promise of the prime minister, Horning. The recognition should mean that the named firm should receive the sales sum and out of that retain 10 per cent, which was to be used as Christmas directed. This recognition would have placed Seligman in a position to guarantee Christmas's promises to his tools, etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a further extract from the Folkets Avis, Copenhagen, February 11, 1902, which, in speaking of Christmas's work, prints this paragraph:

And after that it appears to us that the Danish minister, Mr. Brun, has played a perfect stasis rôle, though one should expect him to be fitted for the head rôle. What in the world have we ministers for when they are not to be used on such occasions?

The Social Demokratten, February 17, 1902, in speaking of Christmas's report, among other things, says:

The facts revealed are based upon a confidential report from Captain Christmas to the Sehested ministry. That report was at first only sent to Sehested himself, but afterwards a copy was sent to each one of the other ministers. It contains the information that Mr. Christmas was obliged to bribe American politicians in order to secure their interest for the purchase of these islands. Since he had no money with him, it was necessary to bribe them on credit, which naturally became much more expensive. When it is reported, therefore, that he is to receive 2,000,000 kr., it must be understood that a large sum of money is to be paid to Americans if the islands are sold.

The following extract is from the Nationalitidende of February 14, 1902:

This paper, which, I think, from information I have, I am safe in calling Denmark's most conservative and most careful newspaper, published on this date an article criticizing the negotiations used by Denmark toward America. The following is an extract from a two-column article: "In order to make it specially clear to the Americans how willing we are to let us Jew down we make the offer to pay to get rid of our goods. Like certain businesses giving a coffee-pot gratis with each pound of coffee so Denmark offers the Americans one and one-half million kroner on buying 15,000,000 kroner's worth of islands, and as an explanation for this method of procedure it is whispered secretly and confidentially in corners that this is now once necessary, you understand * * * but by all means keep quiet about it."

It seems as if it never struck Mr. Christmas and those back of him that they by such business principles committed the greatest insult against the United States politicians. How? It is of high importance to the States to secure some little islands, and the leading American politicians must be bribed in order to further or at least not to oppose their country's interests. * * *

An unpardonable use has been made of the State's money secured by the sale of Danish territory, since the sale price belongs without any reductions, including the famous 10 per cent, to the Danish state treasury and to no one else.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in proof that this is a correct copy of the report, we have—

First. Copies of Danish papers in which most of the report has been published.

Second. Christmas himself, in an article over his own signature, published in Denmark's largest politiken on February 11, 1902, admitting that it is his secret report to the Danish Government which is being so freely used for the public, he says:

"There is, however, one point which attracts general interest. How has my report reached out to the public? I sent out at the time this confidential report to each one of the nine ministers which constitute the Sehested ministry. There existed only those nine copies.

"Who has stolen or who has given out this document which now is being so freely used for creating scandal? How, on the whole, is it possible that such a secret document, which, according to the nature of its contents, never should come to the public knowledge, can disappear from the ministry?"

In proof that Prime Minister Horning had promised Christmas 10 per cent, we quote a paragraph from an article published in Vortland on February 5, 1902.

On January 14, 1901, Captain Christmas sent to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Folkething a written statement in which he recounted his efforts and set forth his claim.

He presented the case thus: That he had definite legal claims, and that he meant to make good such claims at the right time and place. Mr. Horning, former prime minister, was asked if he had made an agreement with Christmas, and Mr. Horning, in a written statement to the minister of finance, Mr. Scharling,

dated February 9, 1901, says he had promised Christmas to ask Rigsdagen's consent to pay him 10 per cent if the sale took place.

He asked the Danish Parliament, or Congress—whatever it may be termed—to pay him 10 per cent if the sale took place. He says this contract had been made. In Vortland of February 2, 1902, this paragraph appears:

Captain Christmas commenced his second trip to America on January 7. Previously he had negotiated with Prime Minister Horrning about the pecuniary side of the question. The prime minister agreed that Christmas could operate with 10 per cent of the sales price of the islands. America should pay the money to an American bank. For this Christmas had chosen the firm of I. & W. Seligman & Co., in New York. This firm should retain 10 per cent of the sum and send direct to Copenhagen.

Christmas came to America, Mr. Speaker, from the evidence that I have, in the fall of 1899. The first official step taken in the furtherance of the present treaty was taken because of this trip of this gentleman to America, when he had an interview, as he says in the report, with the Secretary of State.

In the preamble of the resolution I have stated that this man was at one time a representative of the American Government. That appears to be a strange statement. He was a subject of Denmark.

Now, I wish to explain here why I say he was a representative of this Government. He came and presented himself to the Secretary of State and offered in some way to bring about the sale of these islands. The only way by which he became the agent of the United States that I know of was that he was engaged to put on foot the preliminary steps looking to this sale and to the pending treaty. He came to our Secretary of State, and, as he shows in his report, was sent to conduct a diplomat of the United States to the Danish court and there present him.

He was directed first to go to London. He did go to London; and there, as he was told by the Secretary of State, he would find introductory letters to our legation there and further instructions. He went there and was informed that Mr. White, of that legation, would accompany him to Copenhagen, to put on foot these negotiations looking to the treaty of sale. He did go. Mr. White did not go in the same conveyance, as I believe, with this agent from London, but that was on account of the illness of some member of his family; but that is not material. He did join him in Copenhagen.

After this agent met Mr. White in the American legation in London he did, with all reasonable diligence, proceed to Copenhagen, where he met this man Christmas, who, at least at that time, was acting as agent for the American Government, and by him Mr. White was presented to the Danish court or to the prime minister. That he was the guest of Captain Christmas at his hotel while he was in Copenhagen can not be denied, if the report is true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Denmark the negotiations were handed down from the Horrning ministry, which first put them on foot, to the Sehested ministry, and from the Sehested ministry to the present Deuntzer ministry, which later concluded the pending treaty. So that there have been two administrative changes since the matter was put on foot in Denmark by Mr. Christmas and Mr. White.

As proof that the official negotiations begun by Horrning on Mr. White's visit to Copenhagen were continued through the various administrations I quote from an editorial in the largest Government paper, the *Politikan*, dated February 10, 1902:

The present Government found this affair far advanced on its coming into power. * * * Though naturally the liberal government could have cut off negotiations, perhaps also on account of previous workers, if they had not been approved of, but what the conservative governments had begun and approved of that the liberal government continued.

I read this to show that the two administrations that followed the Horrning government, which made the contract, continued in existence down to the present date the contract with Christmas to spend this \$500,000.

I read again, Mr. Speaker, from the Vortland, February 5, 1902:

The new (Sehested) cabinet on finding the question handed down from the Horrning ministry was, even though it did not itself feel that the sale of the islands was desirable, obliged to continue negotiations with America, which had already brought about the result that there had been sent from the foreign minister of the United States a draft for a treaty.

The same paper on February 13, 1902, says:

When Horrning's ministry was relieved by the Sehested ministry, Mr. Scharling became minister of finance. He was opposed to the sale of the islands, and had been among those prominent men of all parties who had publicly protested against the sale. There was therefore reason to believe that the negotiations with America would be broken off or allowed to run out in the sand.

The Sehested ministry let it become known that it was not with pleasure that it took over the affair from its predecessors. The negotiations with America were not broken off, however, only prolonged through the Sehested ministry and continued by the Deuntzer ministry (which is the present ministry of Denmark), with the result that a treaty between the two countries has been arrived at.

I have shown, sir, beyond controversy, as it seems to me, that this report is a report made by this diplomatic agent of Denmark to his own Government. I have shown that he was a quasi if not a real agent of this Government in instituting these proceedings—that is, the proceedings which led to this treaty. Mr. Speaker, to show that I have not exaggerated the charges made by this corrupt bargainer, and that they are worthy of our consideration and investigation, I propose to read a few extracts from that report. In an interview which this man Christmas had with the prime minister of Denmark in Copenhagen he speaks of his experience in this country. I shall quote literally from this report, but it is too long for me to read it all. I shall ask to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and as a document, but I quote from that report—

Mr. CANNON. What is the report the gentleman speaks of now?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What I now purpose reading are extracts from the report.

Mr. CANNON. What report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The report of Walter Christmas, made to the Danish Government, on which I am commenting. I would read it all, I state to my friend from Illinois, but in my time I could not read it; it would take me more than an hour to read it to the House. I have therefore culled some luscious extracts from it, some delicious extracts, which I am ashamed to offer, and if they be true they ought to bring the blush of shame to every man in this country, and no man, white or black, in it should object to an investigation. If they are true they bring disgrace upon this country here and in every foreign land in the world.

I will quote now from the report some things that this corrupt bargainer says were said while he was speaking with the prime minister of Denmark:

His excellency (that is, the prime minister) expressed himself with greater force than I wish to report. His abhorrence for the political situation in America which made it necessary to offer money in order to bring a political action like that of transferring the islands to a successful termination, but that he had long ago discovered the necessity for making such a money sacrifice and he was ready to grant it.

Further on he says:

Besides, I made the acquaintance of the President's brother, Mr. Abner McKinley, who is a lawyer and has a business in New York, together with his partner, Colonel Brown. These two gentlemen are only very little respected, and their business, which specially consists in securing certain firms contracts and concessions from the Government, is, without question, anything but nice, but both Mr. Brown and Mr. Abner McKinley have the entrée to the White House at Washington. They know most accurately almost all the winding paths through Congress and are well informed as to what members of Congress must be paid, as well as the method which must be used to accomplish it.

And again:

The next day I went to New York, where I remained until November 20, on which day I received a written request to come to Mr. Hay. Mr. Hay immediately told me that he had investigations made both as regards the German company on St. Johns and my chart, that my representations had proven correct, and that he would now take steps to begin negotiations with the Danish Government for securing the Danish colonies.

I asked him to remember that the Danish Government knew nothing of my visit to Washington, to which he replied that he could make no mistake as to my position, since I myself had declared not to possess credentials of any kind, but that Mr. Hay would highly appreciate it if I personally would accompany a trusted diplomat to Copenhagen and secure for him a secret meeting with the chief of the Danish Government.

I gave the minister frankly the information that I had promised, besides others, President McKinley's brother and his partner a certain sum. Besides, I had bound to me two press associations, one in Washington and one in New York, and that I had an understanding with the banking firm I. & W. Seligman & Co. that they were to assist me, all, of course, upon the conditions that the sale of the islands took place.

The minister expressed that he found the political conditions in America horrible, but "that it had been known for a long time, and I can let you dispose of the 10 per cent, but not any more." His excellency asked me what I thought I would make out of the affair. I replied that it hardly would be very much. His excellency: "That you must certainly try to arrange, for more than 10 per cent I can not secure for you, and it would be too bad if you should get nothing for yourself."

Again he says:

It was not alone the members of Congress I had to invite.

He is speaking at this point in the report of inviting members of Congress to dine with him at the Hotel Raleigh in this city. He says:

It was not alone the members of Congress I had to invite. I had as my special assistants two men, C. W. Knox, who was an intimate friend of Senator MARK HANNA, and Richard P. Evans, a lawyer in Washington, who represented Mr. GARDNER and his friends in the House. These took an active part in the personal agitation, since they talked with a large number of members of Congress and agitated for the purchase of the islands.

I had contracts with them both, according to which they and through them certain members of Congress should have a share of the commission if the sale took place; but the two gentlemen's agitation, expenses, etc., bills in restaurants and hotels, I had to pay. The two press associations, Abner McKinley, and Brown, Evans, Knox, and others, I had promised that their contracts should be guaranteed by the house of Seligman. To this the banking house had agreed, as it should in one way or another have to be recognized by the Danish Government.

Mr. Speaker, I could make more of these quotations, but I will not take the time of the House. It is enough to show what a

report this creature has made to the Danish Government, this man whom our Secretary of State used as an agent—I was about to say tool, but as an agent—to carry a trusted diplomat from our legation in London to the court at Copenhagen, who there entertained this trusted agent and procured him admission and introduction to the prime minister of Denmark, which resulted in putting on foot the negotiations leading to this treaty.

Now, sir, I am not here to charge, and I do not charge, that any American Member or Senator has been bribed in this matter, but here is the declaration of this agent of the Danish Government and of our own Government that he had contracts for \$500,000 of the money which we supposed we were paying into the treasury of Denmark for these islands, to be used, as he says, for the corrupt purpose of bribing American Congressmen.

Does not this demand an investigation at our hands? Are we to sit here and permit this paper to be published in the leading papers not only of Denmark and of the United States—because a portion of this report making these charges has already been printed in a Philadelphia paper and in some other papers in this country—but printed also in the newspapers in all the capitals of Europe? I have seen a notice of it in the London Times. It has been printed, I venture to say, in the leading papers of every capital in Europe. These charges have gone forth to the world that there is a condition of affairs in the United States Congress, as described by this agent to the minister of state in Denmark, which is characterized as something that is simply horrible and which it appears the minister said has been known for a long time.

Does such a state of affairs exist, Mr. Speaker? Every member of Congress can be called and interrogated upon his oath whether or not he met this man Christmas, whether or not he dined with him at the Hotel Raleigh, and if he knows of any improper means having been used in any way to make public opinion in favor of the ratification of the treaty for the purchase of the Danish islands. I repeat that I do not say these charges are true. I have brought them before the House from a sense of duty. And in order that this House and the country may see that I have not exaggerated, that I have not misquoted the allegations made in the report, I shall ask that it be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then each gentleman to-morrow morning can read and digest it with his breakfast, if he desires to do so.

Mr. Speaker, one other point. I have so far made no reflections upon any American official; but I do say this, that these facts that I have submitted here, the newspaper extracts, show that the charges of corruption against the American Congress have been public in Denmark, and the allegations at corrupt contract business have been published there since the 28th day of January. These things have appeared daily in the papers at Copenhagen. We did not know, and I take it that the Senate of the United States did not know on the 17th day of February that \$500,000 of that money had been bargained away for the corrupt purpose of buying them and you and the balance of us, into the support of the treaty of sale; and yet on the 17th day of February the American Senate almost unanimously, as I believe, and as has been published in the newspapers, ratified the treaty.

Did they know, Mr. Speaker, when they ratified the treaty that these things were being published in Copenhagen, Denmark? Did these United States Senators, did the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate know this? I do not know, but this is the first time the attention of this House has been called to this disgraceful charge. I have shown you that the publications began as far back as the 28th of January, that they continued through the first half of the month of February. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is, it seems to me, one thing unpardonable in this whole business, and that is that the Department of State must have known of the publication of these infamous charges in Denmark and in Copenhagen for two weeks, or nearly three weeks, before this treaty was ratified and took no notice thereof so far as I know.

If with full knowledge of these facts, with the light turned on as this report turns it on when published; if, in other words, with full knowledge of all the facts, the Senate of the United States—Senators of both parties—said, "We will ratify this treaty," I would bow to their act. But I do not believe that these facts and charges were in their possession when they voted with so much unanimity to ratify this treaty.

Were they not entitled to have these facts? We have an American minister at the court of Denmark, resident in Copenhagen. Where was he from the 28th of January until the 17th of February, the day the American Senate ratified the treaty? Do you suppose he failed to give notice to our premier; do you suppose that our Secretary of State was not in full and complete possession of these allegations? If so, I respectfully ask if the American Senate and the American people were not entitled to have the benefit of these charges?

Mr. Speaker, this matter is still here with us, as we have not

appropriated the purchase money. I am not here to oppose the purchase of the Danish Islands; I am now of the opinion that we ought to own them. They are right at our door. I think we need the harbors that they offer there. I am not objecting to the purchase; but I do object, I have the right to object, when you come and ask me to vote for \$5,000,000 to pay for these islands, that I shall not be asked to vote that appropriation with knowledge such as these papers bring to us, that \$500,000 of this \$5,000,000 are to be used for the corrupt purposes indicated in that report. We had better keep that sum ourselves. The report shows, I think, that we could have purchased the islands for \$4,000,000 or even less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have nothing further to say. I believe that these resolutions ought to pass unanimously. I believe they are worthy of the attention of the House. The charges may not be true. I do not vouch for their truth. But here they are in the report of our own agent and the report of the agent of the Danish Government. They ought to be investigated fully and a complete report be made. If the American Congress has been foully slandered, as I believe, and as I hope the proof will show it has, no man will rejoice more than myself.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Before the gentleman begins, I ask that I may be allowed to print with my remarks the reports which I have referred to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the report which he has named. Is there objection?

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman to whom that report was addressed? It has not been stated by the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I beg pardon. I thought I had stated it plainly. The report is addressed to the Danish Government by Capt. W. Christmas, and gives his full Danish name, W. Christmas Dirckinck Holmfeldt, October 1, 1900. It is addressed to the Danish Government.

Mr. OLMSTED. Who is the Danish Government?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir; to the Danish Government.

Mr. OLMSTED. What officer of the Danish Government?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. No officer is named. It is addressed to the Danish Government.

Mr. OLMSTED. Just addressed at large, then.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is addressed to the Danish Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, as he is going to print the full report: Is there anything to indicate that Christmas was simply trying to get a rake-off of 10 per cent, explained it this way, and he could not get it unless he made some such statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. There is nothing in the report to that effect.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the first portion of the "whereas" read again. I would like to see whether the statements that are therein recited are recited apparently with the approval of the House of Representatives and by its indorsement, or merely the reported statement of this man Christmas. Perhaps the gentleman can answer?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let it be read for more certainty.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the first section of the preamble will be read.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman has gone over it so frequently I would like to see whether it is a declaration of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas one Walter Christmas, a subject of Denmark, who is now and has been for several years a diplomatic agent and representative of the Government of Denmark, authorized and empowered to negotiate with the Government of the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, and who was also the agent of the United States for the purchase of said islands, has submitted a secret and confidential report to his own Government.

Mr. HITT. That I object to. I object to that recital being put in the mouth of the House as a declaration of the House. If the gentleman will put it that "it is alleged" or "publicly stated," there will be no objection, but I object to putting a declaration like that into the mouth of the House, that he is a representative of our Government. I can hardly consent to that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's technical objection comes too late, but I do not want any snap judgment. If the gentleman from Illinois thinks the word "alleged" should be inserted, I see no objection.

Mr. HITT. I ask that at the beginning it may be made to read "Whereas it is alleged." Do the words after the second "whereas" contain any such allegation?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If it does I will look at it and make the insertion.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I came in a few minutes after the gentleman from Tennessee began to make his statement. I have listened to him as carefully as I could in his reading of the extracts of this alleged report, and as near as I can get at it on the wing, it seems that some man by the name of Christmas, a Danish subject, that acknowledges himself a briber and worse than a thief, makes certain allegations, and upon those allegations it is proposed to make an investigation, not whether any Senators, but whether any Members of the House of Representatives have been guilty of bribery. Am I correct? Is that the scope of the investigation?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not propose by any admissions to limit the extent of it; the resolution shows the extent. It is to investigate the whole matter from beginning to end.

Mr. CANNON. It was held to be privileged, because it related to members of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It includes members of the House. One member is named in the report.

Mr. CANNON. One member is named?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; he says that he had dealings with him; or at least he mentions the name of one member whose representative he had employed here in Washington.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that escaped me and I would like to have it read. While the Clerk is finding it, I want to suggest—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not a part of the resolution; it was a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What I read, if the gentleman from Illinois is referring to that, is an extract from the report. I read several extracts. What they mean the gentleman can infer as well as I.

Mr. CANNON. Does any extract which the gentleman read, or does the report upon which this investigation is to be founded, if it is ordered, make a charge of bribery against any member of the House of Representatives?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Why, undoubtedly, it makes a charge of bribery. It says that he made contracts for the bribery of the members of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Contracts with whom?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I read the names of the men; I do not care to go over that again. Has the gentleman from Illinois just come in?

Mr. CANNON. I came in after the gentleman from Tennessee began his remarks.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. He says that he had contracts with several gentlemen; I can read them again if the gentleman desires.

Mr. CANNON. Very well, Mr. Speaker; it seems to me it would be wise to make this investigation, if it be worthy of an investigation, and, as this document is to be printed in the RECORD, and as that part of the gentleman's remarks that I listened to was the reading of extracts from newspapers and then his own impressions and remarks, it seems that nothing would be lost if this whole matter should go into the RECORD, and to-morrow morning, after members have had the opportunity to see what is substance and what is not, if it all is not substance the House can take such action as it sees proper.

There is no man on the floor of this House that does not desire that a full investigation be made if the honor of any man is authoritatively called in question in his official capacity or otherwise in the performance of his duty as a Representative. But I do not believe there is a man in this House that desires an investigation of a mere statement of an acknowledged thief. I would be glad if it could go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois make a motion to postpone to a certain day?

Mr. CANNON. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will accept it. I will say to the gentleman that I make the suggestion in the greatest good faith.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I offered this in the greatest of good faith, too, and I shall not agree to it.

Mr. CANNON. It ought not to be passed before the membership of the House have had a chance to read the statements on which the gentleman founds his motion; to read the papers from which the gentleman read very incomplete extracts.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. In reply to the excited and agitated remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, I will now tender this report to the Clerk and ask to have it read, in order that the gentleman may understand what it is. I am perfectly willing to give all the facts that I possess, but I could not undertake to

read all that matter in my time, because, as I said, it would take too long.

Mr. CANNON. We can not follow it from the reading. Therefore, having the floor, I move that this whole matter be postponed until to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. On that we want the yeas and nays.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to say something in reply to what the gentleman from Illinois has said on his motion if he will yield the floor to me for a few moments before he attempts to close debate.

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. About ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that he questions the right to move to postpone this matter to a particular hour; but the gentleman may move to postpone it till to-morrow, subject to other privileged matters. This will be privileged to-morrow, if the motion is made and adopted to postpone until to-morrow without the clause "after the reading of the Journal."

Mr. CANNON. Well, I desire to make that motion.

The SPEAKER. That will make it a special order for to-morrow morning.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to ask whether this motion, if adopted, would interfere with the special order for to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. If the motion of the gentleman from Illinois should prevail, this business will be the special order for to-morrow.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Then I hope the gentleman will make his motion apply to Saturday instead of to-morrow, so as not to interfere with the special order for to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. This will be privileged to-morrow morning if the motion of the gentleman from Illinois should prevail. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman ten minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think, from what the gentleman from Illinois has said, that he addresses his remarks to the true gravamen of this situation. I may be old-fashioned in my ideas, but I believe my country's honor ought to stand above everything else. Now, it is not merely an individual's honor that is at stake in this matter; that would be a small consideration as compared with the honor of our country. That is the question at stake here; that is the true question that is to come for trial before this House.

I care not what you put in your resolution or how you may make it privileged. I say that this fact exists and is shown, that a man—I do not care whether he is a thief or a knave—that a man by the name of Walter Christmas came to this country, attempting first in his own individual behalf to negotiate a sale of these islands; that that man went back to Denmark, accredited by the Government of the United States, to introduce our diplomatic agent to his own Government. Be he thief or knave, he carried our commission for that purpose, and it is denied by no man. When he had done that and the negotiations were opened, it is not denied—nay, it is recognized—that he was sent back here by his Government, not as an official agent, to negotiate this sale.

Mr. Brun, the Danish minister, represented his Government in an official capacity; but it is not denied, and the official records of Denmark show it—it is admitted by the ministers of the Sehested ministry—that this man was the unofficial agent of Denmark to negotiate this trade. Be he thief or be he knave, I care not. They sent him here, and he dealt with our people in this matter. Now, what is the result? He goes back to Denmark and makes a report to the Sehested ministry of what he has done here, and he says in that report to the ministry of his country that he has contracted to expend \$500,000 of the purchase money of these islands with American citizens, with members of Congress and of the Senate, and press associations, for corruption purposes. For what? To put through a bargain that we say is just and right, a proper trade, yet we stand committed before the people of Denmark to the effect that it is necessary to use bribery and corruption in order to get through a proper and legitimate trade with the American people.

Now, what this man says may be untrue. I pray God that it is untrue. But he has made the charge. As these reports show, here is an affidavit stating that this is the report of which this thief or knave—as the gentleman may call him, but the accredited agent of the Danish Government, the unofficial agent—has made

to that Government, saying that he has used \$500,000 for a corruption fund, here under the Dome of our country's Capitol.

Are we to laugh that down? Are we to say that because this man is a knave, that he has no character, that we are above reproach and stand there in that position before the nations of the world? Mr. Speaker, and my fellow-members, if that is the position the American Congress is to take when our country's honor is involved, then I say that the day of our degradation is not far distant. No, it is not merely a question of knowing. I do not believe it is so. I hope it is not so. I hope this man has lied—lied from beginning to end—but when governments use men for corruption purposes they do not use honest men, and this man reports to his Government that he has used their money for corruption purposes.

We do not expect to find them using an honest man for that purpose, but we do know that he has made this report to his Government, that it has been published in the Danish papers, in the London papers, and in probably every paper of Europe, and there our country stands discredited in the face of the world; and would you deny the right of Congress to acquit ourselves; would you deny us the right to show to the world that we have clean hands in this matter? That is what we are demanding. We are not demanding the right to know if some poor weak individual, if it be so, has fallen by the wayside, but we do demand a committee to investigate this matter and show to the nations of the world that the Congress of the United States and the Government of the United States stands with clean hands in this transaction.

Mr. HITT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee inform us of the date of that report?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. October 1, 1900.

Mr. HITT. Is it an official document, or is it a statement from a newspaper?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is not official. It is a typewritten statement.

Mr. HITT. Is it a copy, or purporting to be a copy, made by some one who has had an official document, or is it printed from a newspaper? I could not understand from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is impossible for me to tell how this document got out of the archives of Denmark, but I have produced the evidences, which are satisfactory and conclusive to my mind, that it is a faithful copy, except one page, and I have produced the affidavit here—

Mr. HITT. That is the affidavit of a translator.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes; the affidavit of an American citizen who was in Copenhagen.

Mr. HITT. Does he say it was a genuine report?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. He says that this is, in his judgment, a copy, and that Christmas has admitted that it was a copy, as published in the newspapers there, of his secret report. That is what he says.

Mr. HITT. The matter was so obscurely stated that I could not follow the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. HITT. We know what official documents are.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not say that it is; I do not vouch for it, and I am not going to attempt to answer the denunciations of your colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who says this man is a thief, an admitted thief; but this record shows that he was the trusted agent of Denmark, and it shows one Department of this Administration, the Secretary of State, used him to introduce our minister, Mr. White, at the court of Denmark.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, just one word, and then I will ask for a vote. I never heard of this man Christmas until now. I have no knowledge or information about him, but, on his bare statement, he is a briber and worse than a briber; a thief; that is what I said.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What does the gentleman think if our Secretary of State sent a man like that with our minister from London to Denmark?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the gentleman is not fair to our Secretary of State.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am not unfair. I do not want to be unfair, or to have you put me in that category.

Mr. CANNON. Even upon his own statements, he states—or this man states, and he indorses it—that he came as a secret agent of Denmark—diplomatic—and that the Secretary of State, taking him at his word, told him to go to our representative in London and he would go with him to make these negotiations, and therefore the gentleman says artfully—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Oh, no; it is no art of mine.

Mr. CANNON. That the Secretary made him our agent. Now, Mr. Speaker, one word. I do not know what the fact is

about this matter. If there is anything that ought to be investigated, I am for investigating it; if there is anything in this resolution that is omitted, it ought to be inserted. If there is anything in it that ought to be stricken out, it goes without saying that it ought to be stricken out. It is brought this morning before us, a long document that the gentleman does not read nor purport to read—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a question?

Mr. CANNON. One moment. With a lot of newspaper extracts, and they are to go into the RECORD in toto. Now, then, when this investigation begins, it ought to begin on a proper resolution. Therefore, in common justice, in common fairness, and in common discretion, in my judgment, this matter should go over until to-morrow. It can go into the RECORD and we can have an opportunity to read it, and then, in the light of that information, each individual member of the House can be in condition to act intelligently. The gentleman is not more swift than I am—neither of the gentlemen—to investigate all things that affect Federal officials or the American Congress.

I ask a vote upon my motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. For a question.

Mr. CANNON. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman imputes to me some art in what I said about the Secretary of State. Now, I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of State must have known from the 28th of January until the 17th of February, that these reports were being printed in Denmark papers, and I did say that I thought the Secretary of State should have called the attention of the Senate to it, and if that is a reflection on the Secretary of State, I stand by it. I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the Secretary of State should have called the attention of the United States Senate to the fact that \$500,000 of this purchase-price money was to be used for corrupt purposes, as alleged, whether truthfully or falsely.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that the \$500,000 was used. I do not know anything about it, and until I do know more than the gentleman from Tennessee seeks to know I will not rise in my place and seek to cast dishonor upon any man connected with the Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Why, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the gentleman that the passage of the resolution does not reflect on anybody. We are seeking to keep them from being reflected on. I hope the motion will be voted down, and that gentlemen who are anxious to come to the relief of the American Congress will show it by voting down the motion.

Mr. CANNON. Ah, the gentleman fears the reading of the document in full by all the members of the House which he read extracts from.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That statement of the gentleman from Illinois is not true, and I ask now, before we vote upon it—I have asked and I repeat it—I ask unanimous consent now, Mr. Speaker, that this full report be read at the desk.

Several Members objected.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I prefer that you act upon the full report and not upon my own statements.

Mr. CANNON. It will keep until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], that the consideration of the resolution be postponed until to-morrow, Friday.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness that we should have the resolution and document read.

Mr. SULZER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MERCER. I ask unanimous consent that it be read now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understand it (the resolution) has been amended by the gentleman from Tennessee since it has been read in the House. I understand the preamble has been amended. The gentleman took it for that purpose, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I added the word which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] asked me to add. I added the word "alleged."

The SPEAKER. The House is clearly entitled to have it read. The Clerk will report the resolution.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent again, as we are to vote on this matter, that the full report be now read. Objection was made a while ago with the idea of the matter going over, but we ought to hear this full report. I mean the full report on which the gentleman bases his resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will first be reported, as requested.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will state that the word "alleged" may not appear there as often as the gentleman from Illinois wishes. If not, it can be inserted.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order while the Clerk reports the resolution as amended. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas one Walter Christmas, a subject of Denmark, who is now and who has been for several years an alleged diplomatic agent and representative of the Government of Denmark, authorized and empowered to negotiate with the Government of the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, and who was also the alleged agent of the United States for the purchase of said islands, has submitted a secret and confidential report to his own Government; and

Whereas the said Christmas, agent and representative, as aforesaid, in his said report to his said Government declares and sets forth, among other things, the fact that the Government of Denmark—

Mr. HITT. Stop right there. The essence is right there in the assertion that he has made the report. It should be "alleged" to have made a report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HITT. That word should go in right there.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the said Christmas, agent and representative as aforesaid, in his said alleged report—

The Clerk continued to read as follows—

has contracted, agreed, and obligated itself to pay and turn over to him, the said Christmas, 10 per cent, or about \$500,000, of the proceeds of the purchase money arising from the sale of said islands to the United States, when the same shall have been paid by the United States to Denmark, for the express purpose, as has been declared and set forth by him in his said secret report to his Government, for the bribing of members of the United States Congress and other prominent citizens of this country, and for subsidizing American newspapers, to the end that the pending treaty between the United States and Denmark for the sale of the islands by the latter to the former Government may be so consummated; and

Mr. HITT. No. Whereas it is "alleged" that it is declared. That is what it should declare.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have no objection to putting the words in, and I am willing that the gentleman from Illinois shall insert the words himself.

The Clerk read as follows:

In his alleged secret report.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will add the words "it is alleged" after each of the whereases it will cover the matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This is a matter to be investigated, and I do not want any snap judgment on it.

The SPEAKER. That correction will be made, if there be no objection, after each whereas.

There was no objection.

Mr. LACEY. I would call attention, further, to the fact that the attack is not made on American newspapers, but certain press associations, and you are investigating the whole of the American newspapers.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The Speaker held that we do not investigate the newspapers anyway.

Mr. LACEY. The resolution does not conform with the facts as stated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to correct the gentleman from Tennessee. The Chair did not so hold.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I so understood.

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. LACEY. The resolutions ought to conform to the facts as the gentleman alleges them to be, as alleged.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I am of the opinion that the word "newspaper" is used in Mr. Christmas's report, and in some places "press associations," but, Mr. Speaker, where "newspapers" appear I ask to add "or press associations."

The SPEAKER. This change will be made. Does that cover the matter desired to be read by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]?

Mr. WANGER. I would like to hear the first whereas read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this will be read again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that one Walter Christmas, a subject of Denmark, who is now and who has been for several years an alleged diplomatic agent and representative of the Government of Denmark, authorized and empowered to negotiate with the Government of the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, and who was also the alleged agent of the United States for the purchase of said islands, has submitted a secret and confidential report to his own Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following committee of investigation: Mr. DALZELL, Mr. HITT, Mr. COUSINS, Mr. MCCALL, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Mr. DINSMORE, and Mr. COWHERD.

Report to the Danish Government from Capt. W. Christmas, Dirckinck Holmfeldt, October 1, 1900.

To the Danish Government:

As early as May 4, this year, I permitted myself to hand over to his excellency the prime minister a report of my work in the affair of the Danish West Indian Islands, while at the same time I requested that there might later be given me the opportunity of more fully explaining the case in person. Since in the meantime no such opportunity has been afforded me by his excellency, there remains no other way open to me than by a renewed request to attempt to secure the high Government's attention to this matter.

I believe it necessary to express myself as explicitly as possible with regard to all the details, as I am anxious to give an accurate and complete picture of what has happened to me in this affair, an affair about which I dare believe it will be understood has been one of honor and for the highest good, in which, therefore, I believe I owe those men who have assisted me, no less than myself, as clear a presentation as possible of all the relations and conditions pertaining to it, without which it will be impossible for my efforts to receive fair judgment.

INTRODUCTION.

In order to explain how I, on the whole, came to interest myself in the sale of the West Indian Islands, let me briefly show how these islands, ever since my childhood, have played a rôle in my life and how circumstances have constantly kept my interest in them awake.

My family's economical situation has been closely connected with our colonies in the West Indies. My grandfather, Admiral Christmas, was in his time a very wealthy man. He invested his whole fortune in plantations on St. Croix, which in the beginning gave him a large income. The liberation of the slaves gave him and the other plantation owners a severe injury, which he never got over. At his death he was ruined, and the State took over his plantations. No wonder, then, that my interest in the West Indian colonies was early aroused. As second lieutenant I sailed down there on board a koffardimand and remained on the islands about six months.

I have since, both in men-of-war and privately, visited the islands seven times in the last ten years. I have seen how the plantation owners have become gradually impoverished, how one business firm after another has failed, and how shipping has been reduced. Often I have prepared plans for the betterment of the conditions on the islands. I have tried to establish a steamship connection between St. Thomas and St. Croix. I have worked out and sent to the Government a proposition for a more economical rule (or government) of the islands, and I have tried to start a company for the purpose of making use of the fertile soil on St. Johns by the help of Chinese coolies, but without success, since never have I met in this country any interest for the West Indian colonies. All have skeptically shrugged their shoulders whenever future possibilities for the distant islands were suggested. Without exception all have (at any rate heretofore) expressed the opinion that the islands' only future lay in annexation to the United States.

By studying the old West Indian literature, especially that touching the Danish Islands, I saw that the English, in the beginning of the century, won the colonies and appear to have had the intention of uniting them to the English West Indies. It was the intention of the English to establish a naval station at St. Thomas, but changed this plan when they discovered the large harbor on the east side of the St. Johns. Two English ships were sent into Coral Bay, the whole harbor was carefully measured, and a chart made of it. In the English naval chart archives may still be found the large chart showing what a splendid, deep, excellently protected, and clean harbor St. Johns has, especially adapted to a naval or war station, as batteries or forts can be placed on far-extending peninsulas and on Bock Island, which absolutely protects the entrance. I got the idea that that harbor could be made a new and important source of income to the colonies. I decided to attempt to get established a large and modern harbor, where nature had pointed out such a good place and such excellent conditions. I did not doubt but that good use could be made of such a harbor, since the West Indies, as far as harbors are concerned, is the poorest archipelago in the whole world.

THE HARBOR PROJECT AND ITS RESULT.

In the fall of 1898 I went to the West Indies and examined the conditions on St. Johns. This island has but very few plantations, but the numerous ruins of large stone houses and mills which lie scattered between grassy paths and shrubs remind one of former culture and the soil's fertility. There is to be found splendid grass plains for cattle and extensive woods containing valuable species of wood. I got a large amount of the island's land upon my hand and returned to Copenhagen to secure money for my project of buying the land and using it and for putting the harbor in order for receiving ships.

I worked upon that for several months; secured also a loan of money from different persons interested in my undertaking, but failed to secure enough capital to carry my plan through. I was then advised to seek capital in Germany, and that in a short time I succeeded in doing in Berlin. A syndicate was formed, and I went again to the West Indies, this time in order to study the conditions on the English and French islands and for the purpose of measuring and making a chart of the harbor on St. Johns. This I accomplished in the spring of 1899 and returned to Berlin with chart and plans.

The German syndicate that in the meantime had established itself was "Die Kolonial und Handelsgesellschaft St. Jun," and had laid large plans for bringing the island in under the German sphere of interest by first buying up all the land and afterwards to put the harbor in order for German commercial ships and men-of-war. The plan had been presented to authorities of the German navy, who seemed to look upon it with favor, for just as desirable as it was for Germany to secure a foothold in the West Indies, so impossible did it seem if they should proceed openly by offering Denmark to buy the islands, for it was known that America would never allow another European power to establish itself in the West Indies. On the other hand it seemed possible that Germany, through the indirect way, as proposed by the Company St. Jun, could make use of the newly made harbor and gradually, as time would pass, secure control over the harbor and over the whole island.

I could have no scruples in working for that plan, since nothing could happen without the knowledge and consent of the Danish Government. To a degree it would be necessary that the directions of such a harbor company should be Danish, and leave its seat in Denmark.

The plan was, as already stated, adherence at the highest places, and it was attempted to get the Hamburg-American Line, which had about 60 steamers running in the West Indies, to take up the affair. That company's director, Mr. Ballin, had several conferences with the St. Jun Company director, Admiral Zirkón. Herr Ballin requested certain guaranties of the Government, which it hesitated to give, and the negotiations proceeded very slowly.

On my return from the West Indies the directors of the "Company St. Jun" asked me to go to Denmark to seek the Danish minister of finance, with a view of securing such concessions as to make the establishment of the new harbor possible.

In June, 1899, I sought Herr Schlichtkrull, department chief in the ministry of finance, and later the minister of finance, Horning, and presented to them both the plan, and at the same time explained to them how the situation had evolved itself. The minister was not disposed to give concessions or permission to establish a new harbor, and he expressed as his opinion that

the only thing which could be done for the West Indian Islands was to transfer them to America. Such a transfer would, in the opinion of the minister, be the final outcome. I informed the German syndicate of the result of my interview with the minister of finance, and secured an agreement whereby I would be able to do as I might think best in the project of establishing the harbor in return for paying the syndicate a sum of money.

During the summer of 1899 I found out, quite by chance, that a circle of men in this country, in connection with some Americans, had, in 1897, attempted to effect a transfer of the West Indian colonies to America. That committee consisted of General Bahnson, Captain Bluhme, Redaktor Corstensen, Count Frijs, Folkethingsmand Christopher Hage, Fabrikejer Hagemann, Atatsraad Gustav Hansen, Højesteretsrægt Octavius Hansen, and Redaktor Hörup. The committee, through a native Dane, Mr. Neils Grön, stood in touch with a number of American financiers, Mr. H. H. Rogers, Mr. Flint, etc.

As already noted, the patriotic motive of this committee was to effect the transfer of the West Indian Islands to the United States. It worked with the knowledge and full authority of the Danish minister of finance, and the minister had given his consent to let the committee dispose of 10 per cent of the sales price for furthering the project, since it was taken for granted that the political conditions in America were such that an affair like the sale of the islands could not be carried through without a substantial expenditure of money.

Upon Mr. Hagemann's proposition, Mr. Neils Grön, in the name of the Danish committee, was to apply to Mr. H. H. Rogers for his assistance, and Mr. Rogers declared himself willing to put the matter through Congress on the condition that he be authorized to dispose of 10 per cent of the price. It was further arranged that the banking house of J. Pierpont Morgan in New York and Privatbanken in Copenhagen should represent the Danish Government. The first-named banking house should receive the sum from the American Treasury and deliver it to Privatbanken less 10 per cent, the commission to be paid to America. The work of the committee came to nothing, because the breaking out of the Spanish-American war stopped negotiations, which were not resumed later. But the committee still existed, inasmuch as it had never dissolved itself formally, and its subcommittee, consisting of General Bahnson, Herr Hagemann, and the chairman of the committee, Etatsraad Gustav Hansen, kept in constant touch with the American syndicate through Mr. Neils Grön. This I discovered later, as when I went to America I thought the above-mentioned committee had long before given up the project of sale, and on the whole no longer existed.

When I decided to take up the question of a sale, I presented myself to Department Chief Schlichtkrull and laid before him my plans. Herr Schlichtkrull expressed it as his conviction that my plan would find recognition if it could be carried through, since it was clear to the Government that it was best to hand over the islands, and the department chief expressed besides that there would hardly be any difficulty in getting the right to dispose of the 10 per cent commission, as the previously mentioned committee had had. Department chief inquired of the minister if he would receive me, and on the following day I called on the prime minister.

The minister assumed a very skeptical position toward my project, since, evidently, he did not believe that I could accomplish anything in America. What I specially desired was to get permission to dispose of the same amount of money as the committee three years before and to secure a statement as to the amount Denmark would be willing to accept for the West Indian Islands.

The prime minister assumed a very distant attitude as regards the first question, and said that if my plan succeeded could I (this expression his excellency used) figure upon the same support as the committee. His excellency expressed himself with greater force than I wish to report—his abhorrence for the political situation in America, which made it necessary to offer money in order to bring a political action, like that of transferring the islands, to a successful termination, but that he had long ago discovered the necessity for making such a money sacrifice, and he was ready to grant it. As to the amount desired for the islands, the minister did not wish to commit himself. He said:

"I can surely not then give you the islands in hands that would be quite contrary to all feelings of dignity."

And later:

"On the whole, it is not the idea to sell the islands. To that thought is His Majesty opposed. What could be done is to arrange a transfer on such conditions that we sustain no loss, but it must not appear that we sell."

When I left the minister he said:

"I must honestly admit that I can not see how you can accomplish your project; but, of course I can not forbid you making the attempt, especially since the undertaking can become of value to the country. One can not cast away the private intuition which is necessary, especially here, when the Government can do nothing. It must constantly be remembered that what must be done is to get the American Government to take the first step toward acquiring the islands. The Danish Government is absolutely ignorant of your journey and undertaking."

From that conversation I considered myself at liberty to draw the following conclusion:

- (1) The Danish prime minister and minister of finance desires nothing better than the transfer of the islands on conditions fair to the inhabitants.
- (2) The minister considers it necessary and is willing to place a portion of the sales price to further negotiations in question at the disposition of "the private initiative."
- (3) "The minister will accept a sum of money for the islands which will cover all expenses, the Colonial debt pension, etc., so that the country get out of the affair without loss."
- (4) That my object was to get the American Government to take the first step without having the Danish Government officially even suspect anything of my undertaking. I dare insist that my understanding of the four points was correct, and I have strictly kept to them point for point, as the following will show.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON.

In October, 1899, I went to America via London. I had no connections there, and not as much as a letter of introduction, but I had a decided opinion as to how I should manage, and I had good cards on hand.

(1) On President McKinley's platform in 1896, together with a few reforms of vital interest to the Union, was expressed the desire of securing the Danish West Indies Islands. The President and his followers, the Republicans, naturally, therefore, must consider the acquirement of our islands as being important, and therefore it would hardly become difficult for me to interest the Government in Washington in my plans.

(2) I knew the sentiments of Americans against Germany and their anxiety as regards an attack upon the Monroe doctrine. I could clearly show that the idea of securing directly or indirectly the Danish Islands was not strange in influential circles in Germany.

(3) I knew that the Americans desired to establish a strong naval harbor in the West Indian waters. On the independent Cuba that could not be done. Porto Rico does not own a single good harbor, but America had nevertheless chosen San Juan in Porto Rico as the best place, and had voted \$3,000,000 to improve the harbor. (That project was stopped after I had been in Washington.) St. Thomas Harbor is neither large enough nor especially suited for a

naval station, whereas the harbor on the east side of St. John complies with all the requirements of that harbor. I made a chart, and I felt confident that just that harbor would open the eyes of the Americans to the value of our islands.

All three suppositions proved themselves to be absolutely correct.

From among the many banking houses in New York I chose the firm of I. & W. Seligman as one of the most recognized and most respected, and which at the same time stood in close touch with the Government. The house Seligman is there the American's Naval Department special financiers, and is often used by the Administration in Washington to handle large money transactions. I have never had occasion to regret that selection. Since it was necessary for me to secure an introduction to President McKinley, Mr. Seligman secured me the same through a friend of the President, a wealthy shipbuilder of San Francisco, Mr. Scott.

Besides, I made the acquaintance of the President's brother, Mr. Abner McKinley, who is a lawyer, and has a business in New York, together with a Colonel Brown. These two gentlemen are only very little respected, and their business, which specially consists in securing certain firms' contracts and concessions from the Government, is without question anything but nice, but both Mr. Brown and Mr. Abner McKinley have the entrée to the White House in Washington. They know most accurately all the winding paths through Congress, and are well informed as to what members of Congress must be paid, as well as to the method which must be used to accomplish it.

As the situation was, I could not be too particular in the choice of my assistants, and I must say that the gentlemen, Mr. Brown and Abner McKinley, have rendered me excellent assistance.

Ten days after my arrival in New York I was informed that Mr. Scott had secured me an introduction to the President, and that he awaited me. I went to Washington, and obtained an audience with the President, who received me most cordially. I informed him of the object of my visit, while I pointed to his platform of 1896, and expressed it as my personal conviction that the Danish Government would scarcely refuse to consider with favor a proposition from the Americans for the transfer of the islands on conditions which should prove fair to the inhabitants of the colonies. I made it clear that I acted entirely on my own responsibility, had no connection with the Danish Government, and told my motive was simply my own pecuniary interest in such a sale.

The President admitted that he had always considered it natural and right that America should take over the islands, which, as he expressed himself, had for a long time been on the market. I made sure of that expression to remark that I had every reason to believe that the Danish King would never allow his colonies "to be on the market;" that His Majesty, on the other hand, found it out of harmony with the dignity of the country to sell any part of the land, but that it would be of much economic advantage to the islands to get it under the large Republic, and since His Majesty has only the good of his subjects at heart, do I feel sure that the King will not oppose any arrangement which will give to the Danish Islands such advantages as the natural harbor of the West Indian waters, the United States can offer them.

The President closed the audience when there were announced six Indian chiefs. He requested me to seek Secretary Hay the following day and to discuss the matter further with him, and thanked me for the visit.

The next morning I was received by Mr. Hay in the foreign ministry. I had taken with me my large chart of the harbor of St. John and a pamphlet I had written on the conditions in the West Indies, the fertility of the islands, the harbor conditions, etc.—in short, all which could make the Americans desirous of buying the islands. Mr. Hay, however, did not need much information. He appeared to know all regarding the islands; also that a Danish committee had sought to secure the Government's interest for the sale three years before. Mr. Hay was well informed as regards the unfortunate pecuniary status of the islands, and asked why Denmark did not permit the colonies to export sugar duty free to the mother country. When I laid my chart of St. John's Harbor on the table, it at once caught his interest. He asked me why it was that Denmark had so far neglected so excellent a national harbor as not even to have it marked off by buoys, etc.

I said that we had enough in St. Thomas Harbor which was quite good. Mr. Hay did not appear to take special interest in St. Thomas Harbor. He constantly returned to the harbor of St. John, and evidently believed my chart to be very unreliable. I showed him how much that harbor was thought of by others, and that if America did not care for it then it would interest Germany so much the more. That made a strong impression on Mr. Hay. He became actually very excited when he learned that a German company had contemplated making use of the harbor and of buying the whole island. Once he exclaimed: "They are trying to sneak into the West Indies, are they?"

When I was through reading the papers showing the above, he requested that he might be permitted to keep them and my chart while he thought over the affair. He got my address, and I went. The next morning early I was called up to Mr. Hay. That time Admiral Bradford, Chief of the Navigation Department, was present. My chart lay on the writing table, and both by Mr. Hay and Mr. Bradford I was cross-examined for about an hour. It was evident that the interest in the Danish West Indian Islands was advancing.

The next day I went to New York, where I remained until November 20, on which day I received a written request to come to Mr. Hay. Mr. Hay immediately told me that he had had investigations made both as regards the German company on St. Johns and my chart, that my representations had been proven correct, and that he would now take steps to begin negotiations with the Danish Government for securing the Danish colonies.

I asked him to remember that the Danish Government knew nothing of my visit to Washington, to which he replied that he could make no mistake as to my position, since I myself had declared not to possess credentials of any kind, but that Mr. Hay would highly appreciate it if I personally would accompany a trusted diplomat to Copenhagen and secure for him a secret meeting with the chief of the Danish Government.

Admiral Bradford said: "I have sent in my report of the Danish West Indian Islands, and especially over St. Johns Harbor. I can tell you that my report could not be more favorable to your plans," and the Admiral followed me out in the hall and said: "I will let you know that I not only wish the islands for the Navy, but I intend to demand them."

On the 28th November I received two letters from Foreign Minister Hay, in one of which he informed me that he had written to the ambassador in London about my early arrival. The other was an introduction to the ambassador in London, Mr. Choate.

I could first get away on the steamer sailing December 4, and as a friend of mine, Mr. W. G. Pedersen, had started on the 29th of November, I delivered to him a primary report to the prime minister, at the same time requested him personally to inform the foreign minister, both of which he did.

When I, on the 12th of December, announced myself to the American ambassador in London, Mr. Choate had already received information as to my mission from Mr. Hay, who had given orders that the first secretary to the legation, Mr. White, should incognito go with me to Copenhagen and there confer with the Danish Government about the transfer of the islands. Mr. White's

wife was in the meantime very ill, and he had gone south with her, but had not come farther than Dover, where he awaited a good crossing over the Channel. I decided immediately to go to Dover. Mr. Choate had received instructions from Mr. Hay to keep secret, if possible, the conferences about the sale of the islands. Mr. Choate proposed that Mr. White should meet the Danish minister some place outside of Copenhagen, to which I replied that the minister himself must decide that, but that I would make the proposal. The proposal, however, was not accepted. On the same day I arrived in London I went over to Dover, where I met Mr. White. The next morning we went together to Paris, where we parted. White brought his wife to Bordighera, and I went to Copenhagen.

Mr. White kept me assured of his movements by telegraph, and on the 9th of December he arrived in Copenhagen.

IN COPENHAGEN.

In the forenoon of the 16th December I arrived at Copenhagen. Dr. F. Hansen, son of Etatsraad G. Hansen, who had traveled with me from New York, where to some extent he assisted me as secretary during my activity for the sale of the islands, had arrived in Copenhagen two days before me. Mr. Hansen had, without my knowledge and desire, sought an audience with His Royal Highness the Crown Prince, in order to inform him of my arrival with an American diplomat.

Dr. Hansen has concisely written some of his recollections about several personal happenings. I quote therefrom the following:

"As regards what has happened in America, I can add nothing above what Captain Christmas has already stated. I visited Mr. Hay in Washington one of the last days in November for the purpose of obtaining some papers, and he requested me specially not to say anything about the affair to the American minister in Copenhagen. On the homeward journey I parted from Captain Christmas in London, since he went to Dover to meet Mr. White, and I went directly to Copenhagen. On my arrival here I immediately sought an audience with the Crown Prince, who at that time was Regent during the King's absence. I told him exactly all that had happened to us during our stay in America, about the United States Government's strong desire to get the matter through and about Mr. White's early visit to Copenhagen. His Royal Highness expressed his doubt as regards the possibility of bringing the matter to an early termination. It has several times failed just as it was almost completed. That it would not be safe to be too hopeful before the matter was entirely finished, although it would greatly please His Royal Highness if I should be proven right in my optimistic view, that Captain Christmas had actually been able to put the matter through."

"About a week after I was informed that Gehejmekonferentsraad Vedel to a private person (Generalinde Bruun f. Bluhme) had expressed his disapproval of the fact that I went about and told that I had something to do with the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands. Since I knew that I was absolutely not guilty of any indiscretion, and that His Royal Highness the Crown Prince was the only one with whom I had discussed the affair, I sought Gehejmekonferentsraaden to get the mistake corrected, and on that occasion had a prolonged conversation with Gehejmekonferentsraaden. It appeared that he actually had entertained the idea as above expressed."

"He admitted, however, his mistake after hearing my presentation of the affair. Gehejmekonferentsraad Vedel appeared in the beginning to feel strongly against the idea of having Captain Christmas having anything to do with the affair. It appeared, however, that His Excellency changed his mind slightly after I had more closely informed him of the circumstances, especially after he had heard of Christmas's relation to the prime minister, Mr. Hörring, and about the accomplished results, viz, Mr. White's visit to Copenhagen."

So much for Dr. Hansen's report.

Gehejmeraad Vedel had, however, as above said, expressed himself with indignation about my efforts in America to Generalinde Bruun, who evidently believed that I had taken the affair out of her son's (Kammerherre Bruun, in Washington) hands, and at once wrote and told him the whole affair, which should have been kept secret. This was the reason for and the beginning of Mr. Bruun's jealousy and enmity toward me, feelings which he, even in affairs of so great importance, could not control while I worked for the Danish Government in America.

Two hours after my arrival in Copenhagen I presented myself to the prime minister in the treasury department. The minister received me very cordially and was greatly interested in hearing how the affair had evolved itself, and about Mr. White's expected arrival. The minister said:

"Well, thanks to God, that the sale now can be brought about, I must compliment you for what you have accomplished. I had really not believed that it would have been possible for you."

The minister would not agree to meet Mr. White either in Roskilde or in Malmö. "I can not see what is the use of all that secrecy. The meeting must naturally take place here in the foreign ministry." Some time after His Excellency asked what language I thought Mr. White could use. I answered that besides English I knew he could talk excellent French, which I had experienced in Paris. The minister replied: "It is too bad that of those two languages I am not at all familiar." "It is possible that Mr. White understands German." The minister: "German I understand quite well; that is, I can read, but I lack entirely the practice in speaking it." The minister ended up by proposing that the foreign minister, Mr. Ravn, should meet Mr. White instead of himself.

The prime minister asked me about the conditions. I informed him then how I had insisted upon both over for President McKinley and over for the foreign minister in Washington that the Danish Government would not in any way make a business out of the islands, and would only consent to a transfer on such terms that Denmark should not sustain a loss. I had said as my opinion that the sum would likely come up to about three and a half million dollars, but I said to the prime minister that the American Government would be sure to give more if it was demanded. The minister said: "We can hardly do it for less than \$4,000,000," to which I replied that it would be sufficient to show Mr. White that, and the size of the sum would play an unimportant part.

I then touched upon the question of the commission and pointed out how I, in conformity with the minister's expressions to me before my departure, had allowed myself to make use of the same 10 per cent which the former committee had had a right to dispose of. I gave the minister frankly the information that I had promised, besides others, President McKinley's brother and his partner a certain sum. Besides, I had bound to me two press associations, one in Washington and one in New York, and that I had an understanding with the banking firm, I. & W. Seligman & Co. that they were to assist me, all, of course, upon the conditions that the sale of the islands took place.

The minister expressed that he found the political conditions in America horrible, but "that it had been known for a long time, and I can let you dispose of the 10 per cent, but not any more." His excellency asked me what I thought I would make out of the affair. I replied that it hardly would be very much. His excellency: "That you must certainly try to arrange, for more than the 10 per cent I can not secure you, and it would be too bad if you should secure nothing for yourself." I: "If it should come short (for 10 per cent is not very much to use for such an undertaking), would it not be possible

for your excellency to secure me some from home?" His excellency: "That I can not guarantee you. I can only promise you to do my best in that way; but you know very well how narrow-minded are the peasant members of the Rigsdag." The minister asked me if I was personally acquainted with the committee, and proposed that I should meet with the members of it. His excellency said:

"The committee will surely take the greatest interest in the undertaking. They are excellent people; especially Mr. Hagemann can be of great assistance. He is well acquainted with American conditions. It will be of great assistance both to you and to me if the negotiations are supported by the committee."

I promised to put myself in touch with the committee immediately. As one will see from the above, I had every reason to be satisfied. The prime minister had on no point disavowed me. He had complimented me for what I had accomplished; had expressed himself willing to negotiate with the American representative upon the same basis as was mentioned in Washington. The islands should not be sold, but transferred to America, on the condition that Denmark sustained no pecuniary loss. The minister had given me right to dispose of 10 per cent of the commission and had even promised to do his best to secure for me a commission besides what I could make out of the 10 per cent.

Etatsraad G. Hansen's son, Dr. Folmer Hansen, applied in my name to his father, the committee's chairman, and requested a meeting. That was brought about the next evening, though only the subcommittee met, since several of the members were absent from the city. The subcommittee consisted of the chairman, Etatsraad G. Hansen, General Bahnson, and Fabrikjer Hagemann.

The chairman, and afterwards Mr. Hagemann, expressed themselves satisfied with what I had accomplished, complimented me on that point, and afterwards we discussed what was further to be done. It was agreed upon that a new plan had been adopted for accomplishing the sale of the islands, brought forward by a new man, and based upon new chances—as, for example, the new harbor on St. John—but that the aim was the same as when the committee worked, as well as the means for accomplishing the result, viz, the 10 per cent commission. As regards that point, none of those present had entertained the slightest doubt, and that is best shown by the fact that the gentlemen unanimously advised me to effect a relation with the American members of the syndicate, the gentlemen Gron and Rogers, in part for the purpose of giving over a proper portion of the commission to them. Not only would it be dangerous to secure those gentlemen's enmity, but their assistance would to a high degree further the undertaking. Especially Mr. Gron had done a great deal of work for the sale of the islands before, and therefore had a right to consider himself entitled to a pecuniary advantage. I felt convinced of the accuracy of all that, and wished no thing more than the opportunity of working together with Gron and Rogers. I promised to offer to them as much as was possible of the 10 per cent.

Later it will appear that I offered to them over half of the commission—namely, \$200,000.

Etatsraad G. Hansen offered to give me a letter to Mr. Gron and Fabrikjer Hagemann and one to Mr. Rogers.

We next discussed Mr. White's expected arrival and his conference with the foreign minister, and Mr. Hagemann then showed how important it was that the islands were admitted into the American tariff union. I promised to talk with Mr. White concerning that. Of our conference that evening, as well as later, a report was made in the committee's journal by Etatsraad G. Hansen personally. It will therefore be easy to have confirmed if my statements are true.

On the evening of December 19 Mr. White arrived, and I drove him to the Hotel Phoenix, where during his stay he was my guest. In order to remain as much as possible incognito, I gave his name as "Schwartzkopf, from Berlin." That precaution, however, was not worth much, since a couple of times daily he received telegrams under his right name from his wife at Bordighera. In the meantime he visited no one here, not even the American minister. He was always in my presence. The only ones who recognized him was Baron Reedtz Thott and Baroness Reedtz Thott, who one day sat at the table next to us at the hotel.

On the 20th took place the meeting at the foreign ministry, but before that Mr. White came to my room and requested instructions on different points that might be brought up in the conference. I still hold a piece of paper upon which he had written down three points, to which I added the question of the tariff; unfortunately to no avail, since the foreign minister forgot entirely to mention it, and Mr. White did not feel himself under obligation to offer better conditions than were demanded from the Danish side.

For the sake of precaution I asked Mr. White how he intended to introduce the conversation, and he replied: "Why, of course, I will tell him that as Denmark wishes to get rid of the islands we might buy them at a reasonable price."

I tried to make him understand that that was the very worst thing he could say, and he promised to begin thus: "That the United States Government, under the just inaugurated colonial-expansion policy, had discovered the advantages which America could secure from acquiring the Danish West Indian Islands, but that naturally the American Government could not possibly under any circumstances intimate to Denmark their possible willingness to buy them before secretly they had secured from the Danish Government the intimation that they were willing to part with their colonies."

Mr. White assured me after the conference that he had used the very words I have said above, and added: "I never saw a man smile like the old fellow when I had given him just your words, so I think they were exactly what he wanted."

I accompanied Mr. White to the foreign ministry and presented him to his excellency. Since I remained in the antechamber, I do not know what took place, except from Mr. White's report, and, since he was in a rather playful mood, I will not repeat his report, except in an abbreviated form.

The minister had declared himself willing to negotiate with America about the transfer of the islands upon such a basis that Denmark should receive enough to cover the colonial debt and the expenses to pensions, etc. To Mr. White's question as to the size of the sum, the minister replied that it would perhaps come to between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000. That gave the American later an opportunity playfully to say, "The old fellow was not much of a business man. Why didn't he ask \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000? Of course he can not expect us to give him more than \$4,000,000 after that."

During the conference Kmhr. Krag was called, and he and Mr. White then went into the archives, where the necessary material from the minister of finance was to be obtained, so that Mr. White could take notes of the islands' budget, debts, pensions, Crown estates, etc.

Under that adjournment of the conference, Minister Hörring, accompanied by Department Chief Schlichtkrull, came in to find out how the meeting had resulted. Both appeared well satisfied when they later passed through the antechamber where I stood, and the minister said a couple of friendly words to me.

After Mr. White came out from the archives he remained for a short time with the minister. The conference lasted about an hour. We then took a long walk together, during which Mr. White recounted to me the whole of the conversation with the minister and Mr. Krag.

Mr. White was very well satisfied with the result of his journey, and he expressed it as his conviction that the islands before one year would be American. He said: "The price is not at all the question; but as your Government won't make any bargain, why, of course we don't wish to pay more than necessary. It is a very fine feeling (not to wish to sell the islands). We Americans are more in the business line, don't you know. We hardly understand those feelings." Mr. White departed that evening.

When on the following evening I met with the subcommittee I informed them of Mr. White's report of the conference, and especially that the tariff question had not at all been discussed. Mr. Hagemann was very angry about that, as well as the other gentleman, and found that it was absolutely a scandal that the most important point had been forgotten. He predicted that there would spring up a strong sentiment against the sale of the islands if the colonies did not get free trade with America.

Mr. Hagemann was certainly right therein, for if the sugar from the islands could be sold on the American market without duty the property there would rise in price 40 per cent. I offered then to telegraph Mr. White and request him to add to his report to Mr. Hay in Washington the demand for free trade. That request was accepted. Mr. White answered by telegraph that the desire would be complied with. A letter to me from Mr. Hagemann of December 27, 1899, shows the importance he places on the question of free trade for West Indian Islands. He writes: "Thanks for the information as regards Mr. White's report. It was fortunate that the most important point of all was considered from the beginning."

I have during my whole work in the affair of the West Indian Islands sought assistance and counsel from a lawyer to the supreme court, Mr. Salomon. It is therefore quite natural that I at the time, while I was constantly conferring with the prime minister (naturally keeping Mr. Salomon constantly informed of such conferences), should several times request Mr. Salomon in my stead to talk to the prime minister, to whom I had, with Mr. Salomon's consent, expressed the fact that he was my adviser. Mr. Salomon answered my request that he naturally would be ready to seek the prime minister in case he should express the desire to see him, but that without such expressed desire he could not trouble the minister by requesting a conversation.

However, on the 27th of December a conversation took place between the prime minister and Fr. Salomon, since the latter, without any request from me, on that day sought the minister. I have requested Fr. Salomon himself to write down and present to the prime minister a report of their conversation and everything else known to him regarding my work for this affair. To this report, the contents of which are known, I take the privilege to call the High Government's attention.

It was clear to the prime minister that it was necessary for me again to return to America; that I, as it were, had all the threads in my hand, and knew the persons who should agitate during the coming negotiations and acts in Congress. Besides that, Mr. White had urgently advised the foreign minister to let me complete what I had begun, since I, as Mr. White expressed it, was *personae gratissima* in Washington.

In the meantime I had used up all my personal means during my trips to West Indians and America, since the Danish Government had now accepted all my plans touching the sale, and furthermore desired to make use of my assistance, it appeared to me reasonable that the Government should pay my journey, or at least a part thereof. The prime minister was perfectly willing to do this, but he had no funds from which to take the money. It was then arranged that Mr. Hagemann should advance me a sum of 6,000 kroner, against the guarantee of the minister of finance. That sum should be regarded as an advance on what I should make out of the 10 per cent commission. Hagemann brought about that arrangement by, together with Etatsraad G. Hansen, calling in the ministry of finance. Regarding that advance, Mr. Hagemann writes me on December 28: "Etatsraad Hansen and I have just come from the prime minister, who, in accordance with your statement yesterday, requested me to assist you by advancing an amount not exceeding 6,000 kroner, in the form of a letter of credit. That shall be done."

It has always been clear to me that it would be difficult for the prime minister to make any written documents regarding the affair, neither as regards credentials for authority nor guarantees for what by word of mouth was promised me, especially on so delicate a matter as the use of the 10 per cent. The prime minister's word was naturally sufficient. There was that possibility that the minister might die while the affair was in progress, but in that case I should have as witnesses to what was agreed upon such prominent men as Department Chief Schlieckkrull, Fr. Salomon, and the members of the subcommittee, and in case of a change of ministry, all were convinced that the prime minister would give his successors all the information necessary regarding the situation and those binding promises which were the basis for my work for the sale of the islands and upon which hung both my moral and pecuniary existence.

In the meantime there were two difficulties which had to be overcome, and in this the minister had to act personally.

The minister in Washington, Mr. Brun, I have known from my childhood. He has always been an energetic and intelligent man, but reserved and peculiar; an extremely sensitive man about his own dignity. As soon as I heard Dr. Hansen's experience with Gehejmraad Vedel and Generalinde Brun I knew that Minister Brun would be my enemy. I informed the prime minister of this and showed the great danger the whole affair would encounter if Mr. Brun began to intrigue against me in Washington. The prime minister recognized this, and decided to write a letter to Mr. Brun in order to make him assume the right position over for me. At the same time could that letter serve to clear another difficulty, namely, to show the Danish Government's relation to the banker I had promised, and whom the Government's chief had accepted; but the prime minister did not like to write directly to Seligman, and it was necessary to find a means whereby the firm could receive some official recognition.

The prime minister then promised me that in his letter to Mr. Brun he would recognize Seligman as the American bankers on whom I could depend, and who should receive the price of sale for Denmark, and afterwards send it to Privatbanken in Copenhagen with a 10 per cent discount. The prime minister requested from me a copy of my contracts with the firm of J. & W. Seligman & Co., and I sent the copy to the minister's private house in Tordenskjoldsgade. The prime minister's letter to the minister in Washington was sent. The contents I am not acquainted with, but the results I know. Mr. Brun worked with great energy against me. He was successful in ruining my position and my name in Washington. He refused to enter into relations with Seligman, and thus I never got my bankers recognized. About that later. I shall only in this connection remark that the recognition of my bankers was the basis for my whole effort. I had no money above that which I should use personally, and to bribe politicians and buy journalists on credit is naturally very difficult. At any rate, guarantees must be furnished.

By recognizing my bankers the prime minister gave me the necessary pecuniary backing for the money offers it was necessary for me to make in order to get the islands sold. This the minister recognized, and expressed it both to me and to my lawyer, Salomon. The Danish minister in Washington should have by word of mouth given the necessary recognition, but he refused it absolutely.

There was one more affair to arrange before I started on my journey. I

had been dismissed from the service of the navy by a court-martial, and that fact could become ruinous to my efforts if anybody should use that easily obtainable weapon against me in Washington, and thereby make me impossible with the American Government. When the prime minister had used my service and secured for me the means for the journey, since I had already had personal intercourse with the President and foreign minister of the United States, and since I was the one who had personally presented the American diplomat to the Danish foreign minister, it appeared to me in harmony with all the parties' interests that my position should be changed.

I therefore applied in this connection, to the men about whom I know, that he both deserved and possessed the absolute confidence of the prime minister, viz. Mr. Hagemann. Mr. Hagemann realized that my desire was opportune, and promised to take up the affair, about the good result of which he had no doubt, but the good result did not come. Mr. Hagemann has since told me that he did all he could for me, but in the meantime the withdrawal of judgment against me was refused for the present, but intimated as a possibility in the event of the success of my mission. I should here remark that the minister of the navy, Ravn, at one time prevented me from resigning, since I preferred that to dismissal by court-martial. Mr. Ravn said to my father, who gave in my resignation: "Your son can at the very highest only receive a couple of months in the fort, and that is nothing to speak of. Besides, if he sends in his resignation he will not receive that recognition that is due him on account of his courageous work in Siam."

In this matter Mr. Ravn prevented me from resigning, and I thought that I could expect from him that he would make use of this opportunity to make good again the injustice which he had previously done. But I was mistaken. My dismissal by court-martial should continue to hang on me as a chain about my leg. Neither the foreign minister, Ravn, nor the prime minister wished to take up the affair, and what I anticipated happened. My enemies in America made use of this means to the fullest extent. Mr. Braun started the startling news that the man who had gone between the American and Danish Governments had been kicked out of the Danish navy by a court-martial both in the American foreign ministry and in the good society in Washington. Mr. Neils Gron took good care that the press got hold of the scandal and was delicately used.

The day after Mr. White had been at the foreign ministry it was published in the papers (from Danish journalists). It went over England to America, and thereby Mr. Rogers and Mr. Gron secured the information that the affair of the islands was again up.

On the same day that I left Denmark Mr. Hagemann received the following telegram from Mr. Rogers:

"MAR. 11, 1900.

"Danish islands up again, with prospects of success if worked with proper parties. Would like authority to speak.

"H. H. ROGERS."

Mr. Hagemann sought me at the hotel and gave me a copy of telegram. Together we wrote an answer, which was as follows:

"MARCH 1, 1900.

"The sale is in official channels. Have protected your interests. Await arrival Captain Christmas, St. Paul, with introduction to you.

"HAGEMANN."

On January 5 I received in London the following:

"Captain CHRISTMAS, *Hotel Savoy, London.*

"Following cable is sent: 'Sale is in official channels. Await arrival Captain Christmas, St. Paul, with introduction to you.

"HAGEMANN."

I left Copenhagen on January 8 after I had had a farewell audience with the prime minister. The minister asked me to do all in my power to get the price up to \$4,000,000; told me about his meeting with my lawyer, Salomon, to whom he sent his thanks for the visit he (Salomon) had paid the minister; advised me with much cordiality to be sure to see that I got my share out of the 10 per cent, and said in conclusion: "God be with you, and do not forget to send frequent reports."

No one who knows anything about the affair doubted that on my departure I had commission from the Danish prime minister to work for the sale of the islands, and that I had the right to dispose of 10 per cent of the sale price. I do not know whether from a legal point of view there is a difference between a verbal and a written authorization. Certainly from a moral point of view there can be none. There can be no difference between a man's verbal promise and his written one. The supreme court lawyer Salomon has clearly expressed himself to me as to his understanding of the relation between the prime minister and myself and as regards the authorization given me. The subcommittee also had no doubt on that point.

Mr. Hagemann requests me that all money transactions in regard to the sale should go through Privatbanken, on the ground that that bank at a former time was interested through him. He would not make such a request to me if he did not know that I had it in my power to arrange the money matter as I might think best.

And when Rogers later (see below) telegraphically requested subcommittee to leave me "disinterested Christmas" the gentlemen replied: "This is impossible, since 'matter is officially in Christmas's hands.'" The subcommittee recognized thereby again the authorization I had received from the prime minister and called it "official."

IN AMERICA.

On the same day that I arrived on the steamer *St. Paul* in New York I sent the two letters of introduction to Mr. Rogers and to Neils Gron.

The first I met the day after in his office in the city. Mr. Rogers is a man of about 60, extremely wealthy, but, in spite of his large fortune of about \$50,000,000, exceedingly desirous of making money. He is the most active member of the Standard Oil Company, and is both hated and feared in the money world on account of his absolute inconsiderateness in his money operations, which yearly demands a great many offers, both on New York's and Chicago's exchanges. Mr. Rogers was evidently dissatisfied because I had taken hold of the sale of the islands, and he repeated several times, "I wish to make money by this, and don't you forget it."

I asked what sum he demanded for his assistance in the affair, but as to that he would not commit himself. He requested me to see Mr. Gron and further to negotiate with him. When I left, he said, "Now, Mr. Christmas, I don't know if we come to an agreement or not; but, mind you, this island business will never pass through Congress without my consent. I am able to swing 26 votes in the Senate, and don't you forget it."

I sought next Mr. Neils Gron. This man is a Dane by birth, and has gone through Harvard University. He leads a more mysterious existence than any man I know. He calls himself a journalist, but is not connected with any paper. Most people look upon him as a kind of secret agent either in the service of the police, or else in one or other company's service; but no one, in fact, knows anything about his means of existence or his efforts.

Mr. Gron was absolutely unapproachable. He presented to me the choice of securing him and Mr. Rogers as enemies, which, in his opinion, would make the sale impossible, or to give the whole over into his hands and depart for home. I should have nothing to do with disposing of the 10 per cent

commission. The next day, however, he sought me and offered me \$25,000 of the commission. This was an impossible condition, since I had already disposed of a much larger sum, and I answered him that more than half of the commission it was impossible for me to offer to Rogers and him. Gron refused that offer and prophesied that I would soon realize my error in not handing everything over in his hands.

The next day he brought my wife a long article regarding the sale of the islands, which had the heading, "Pretty woman in St. Thomas deal," and spoke of my wife in the most scandalous manner and expressed insinuations regarding the Danish King. I feel convinced that no other than Gron himself had inspired that article. No American journalist could have known the special relations mentioned therein.

The next day two large New York papers contained interviews with me. My expressions regarding the sales of the islands and the Danish King's position toward the sale were the height of indiscretion and lack of tact. In one of the interviews I told the reporter that President McKinley's brother was to receive an enormous sum of money for bringing about the sale. I had had no interviews whatsoever and had not talked to a reporter since I landed in America. I protested both verbally and in writing to the different editors, but no attention was paid to my demands for a retraction.

I do not hesitate to assert that these and all other false interviews and compromising articles originated from Mr. Gron, directly or indirectly, and thereby he began a fight against me which should last for over two months. Mr. Gron's use of the press absolutely astonished me. It was first later that I found out that Mr. Gron's means are often used in America and that, on the whole, it is placed at the disposition of him who has money enough to offer. It is difficult at home to judge of Americans, and especially American press conditions. I, at any rate, had never dreamed to what a degree the American press is for sale, both for political and other speculations and intrigues.

During my whole stay in America I fought constantly with Mr. Gron to get him to work with me, or at least to cease to oppose my efforts. Late in February I offered him and Mr. Rogers \$300,000 if the sales price should be \$4,000,000. He accepted this, but a week later he broke his agreement and demanded more. During the last part of my stay I was compelled to use strong means to compel him to my side, and I succeeded in getting a binding contract between us. It was at that time too late to get the island question through Congress during the spring session, but it could be passed during the coming winter session. The contract provided that Gron and his friends should dispose of two-thirds and I of one-third of the commission.

I was so much the more anxious to arrive at an understanding with Mr. Gron, as I was afraid that he could overthrow my work, and besides Mr. Gron had—I regret that I have to say—his very best assistant in the Danish minister, Mr. Brun, who at the same time was my worst enemy.

As I have previously remarked, our minister in Washington, even before my arrival, worked against me. Mr. Brun was, through his mother, Generaline Brun, already, before my departure from Copenhagen, made acquainted with my work for the transfer of the islands, and that scarcely on a favorable basis for me, as Generaline had, through Mr. Vedel, according to Dr. Hansen's report, got the impression that I was interfering with the minister's work, which, humorously enough, also seemed to be the minister's own impression.

One could imagine that the minister, from principle, found it improper that unauthorized private persons should appear as politicians, but that was by no means the case. Mr. Brun knew perfectly that I appeared with authorization from the prime minister, especially as he had received written information on that point from the prime minister, and he had at the same time for a long time been acquainted with the former committee's work. Mr. Brun stood even in a very intimate relation to Mr. Neils Gron, whom I several times met in the minister's home. Mr. Gron was always well informed what of interest had taken place regarding the affair in Denmark, and he prided himself upon his good relation to the minister—proud because he knew that I had nothing to pride myself upon in that connection.

The minister did not feel himself in the slightest degree obliged to do anything for me because the Danish prime minister had commended me to his consideration, and he stated several times that, as he had no order from the prime minister, he could not undertake to assist me. The banker Seligman he would have nothing whatever to do with.

Upon the minister's sympathy for Gron, whom he knew opposed me, and his antipathy for myself, I shall not dwell any longer, but I must here express my indignation that Mr. Brun attempted to make me impossible in Washington. He used, in order to create distrust of me, that easily obtainable and unworthy weapon—my discharge from the Navy—and it was made use of in the foreign ministry with members of Congress, with certain journalists, and in the circles of society where my wife had been well received.

As I have previously related, during my former stay in America I had established relations with the President's brother, Mr. Abner McKinley, and his partner, Colonel Brown, besides I had bound to me two press associations in New York and Washington. These different connections brought me once more in touch with a number of Senators and Members of Congress. Congress, in the middle of February, was taken up with the Nicaragua Canal treaty and the extension of the fleets, and both of these affairs had to be disposed of before the question of the Danish Islands could be brought forward.

I shall attempt, in setting forth my work in Washington, to keep close to the reports and letters which I, after agreement with the prime minister and the committee's chairman, Etatsraad Hansen, forwarded to them, and I use quotations from both reports in order to illustrate the progress of affairs.

ETATSRAAD HANSEN, Washington:

Mr. Rogers expressed that he, if he obtained that advantage from the sale which he thought due him, will be pleased to assist me. He requested me to arrange all with Gron, who represented him.

I sent your letter to Gron, who lived at the Waldorf, and next had a meeting with him. I regret much to have to inform you that Gron's position taken over for me was absolutely antagonistic. Gron's opinion is that I have fooled him and ruined his dearest hope that he himself should sell the islands. I had in the meantime substantial hope that I would be able to get Gron and Rogers over. Gron has in the meantime already begun actively against me, as following will show, and he has openly expressed that it was his and his party's intentions to overthrow the affair at present in order late to take it up afresh.

I shall here remark that all that has appeared in American papers called interviews with me are lies from one end to the other. I have not allowed myself to be interviewed and will not. Since the papers, however, have been full of reports relating to me and the sale of the islands, and since it could hurt both myself and the affair, I requested the editor of the Washington Post (the Government organ) to publish a declaration from me. That clipping I inclose. The declaration came out early in order to satisfy the Danish minister here.

I have had a conference with Mr. Hay, who received me very cordially, only he expressed regret that Mr. White's visit to Copenhagen had not re-

mained a secret. He expressed himself very satisfactorily about America's desire to buy the islands. I suppose the question will be brought forward in about a fortnight, as soon as the debate over the Nicaragua Canal and the extension of the Navy is brought to a close.

Papers of all colors have already expressed themselves in favor of the purchase of the islands, and as far as I have heard the Government has both in the Senate and House votes enough to put the matter through.

To-day I am to talk with Senator DEWEY, and other members to whom I have letters of recommendation. In the same way I am to have a meeting with Admiral Dewey, whose influence is very large.

I sent yesterday evening the following cablegram: "Affair looks favorable. Christmas."

I had, as above mentioned, at last made the acquaintance of different Members of Congress, for example, Senators LODGE, DEWEY, CLARK, BACON (the last two were Democrats); members of the House, ALEXANDER, GARDNER, and others. They all took a great interest in the acquirement of the islands, and promised me their very best assistance. I got them to establish the price of \$4,000,000, as the prime minister had desired.

In the meantime I, through indiscretion from the foreign ministry, found out that Mr. Hay would only offer Denmark \$3,500,000, and that it was therefore important as early as possible to get the sum placed at \$4,000,000.

In the last part of January I wrote to Etatsraad Hansen: "Since my last letter nothing official has taken place, but I have accomplished much underhand work. I have been at a couple of secret meetings in Congress, where the plan for future developments was agreed upon. A pair of the leading Senators and some members of the House were present, and the general opinion was that the acquirement of the West Indian Islands would not meet any serious opposition. It was the first intention that some Senators should privately suggest to the President that he should let Secretary Hay apply to the Danish minister here and officially ask if Denmark would sell."

The President, on the other hand, desired for political reasons that the affair should not come from the Administration to Congress, but the reverse. For that reason there is now being prepared a big speech, which on next Wednesday or Thursday is to be delivered by a Member of Congress, Mr. GARDNER, on which occasion the House will express its wish about buying the Danish islands for \$4,000,000. That sum has been decided upon and, if the Government of Denmark insists upon it, will be appropriated. It is not impossible that Hay will attempt to screw down the price, but the \$4,000,000 can be considered sure.

I have sent you the following telegram: "Four million dollars guaranteed," because I could not know how quickly requests would be made, and therefore you should know what sum you ought to insist upon. All appears, therefore, in a most hopeful manner, and if no personal interests intervene in the affair it will go off easily enough.

In the meantime I am somewhat afraid of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Gron. I have even reasons to believe that the gentlemen have intentions of injuring me in Copenhagen, and especially to try to take the affair out of my hands. I believe in the meantime that that will be impossible. Of course it is of little importance whether I personally bring the matter to a close or not, but if all the arrangements which I made for the furtherance of the matter are now overthrown, would it possibly give occasion to a great scandal and litigation? I will, however, try to come to an understanding with Rogers and Gron, but they assumed, as already said, a very antagonistic position toward me.

I have formerly on different occasions touched upon, and repeat here, that Rogers and Gron tried to persuade the committee to take the authority from me. The reply was: "Impossible; matter officially in Christmas's hands."

In Congress all seemed to go after desire, and on January 30 I was able to telegraph Etatsraad Hansen, "To-morrow the House will vote \$4,000,000 for buying the islands."

In the meantime, however, my friends in Congress changed the programme somewhat. Instead of the proposed great speech of Mr. GARDNER, and the subsequent vote of the House, there was in the House brought forward a bill, the so-called Gardner bill of February 1.

I telegraphed to Etatsraad Hansen February 2, 1900, "Resumé Gardner bill yesterday: 'Be it enacted by the House and Senate of Congress assembled, That State Department is authorized to expend the sum not exceeding four millions in acquiring West Indian Islands, and that this act take effect immediately.'"

As regards the significance of that bill, I have expressed myself in my report to the prime minister of the 5th and 2d. By this I have the honor to inform your excellency that all touching the West Indian Islands appears as promising as possible. I had the honor to forward to your excellency a copy of the Gardner bill after previously sending telegraphic resumé of same to Etatsraad Hansen. This bill will possibly not bring the affair to a direct conclusion, but it has established the price as \$4,000,000, and that was its special mission, as Mr. John Hay had attempted to acquire the islands for three to three and a half millions. All has now been prepared as well as it has been possible for me to do. The right people are interested in the affair and I have good reason to believe that negotiations will proceed rapidly in the near future if from Denmark's side no opposition arises. As I have previously permitted myself to express, Gardner's bill will not come to play a decisive part, since the Senate is the place where treaties are ratified. The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose chairman is Senator Davis, will report the affair favorably and then it will immediately be sanctioned, but since it is the House which appropriates the money it is also of importance that this is considered.

It will be seen from the above that I do not give too much importance to the bill. My efforts have been in the direction of supporting the Danish prime minister in his attempt to get the price for the islands set to \$4,000,000, and to that end has the Gardner bill been of service.

It was now my hope that the bill should be put through in the course of a few days, but that did not happen.

There were now in Congress (as Mr. LODGE expressed it) "evil spirits at work," namely, Rogers and his friends.

Senator LODGE, who is the most respected member of the Senate, and who, of all the political persons I have met in America, is the only one that can not be bribed, was my best assistant. It was he who discovered that Rogers was at work, agitating among his 26 Senators, whose votes he thought to be able to control.

Mr. LODGE advised me to seek Mr. Hay, and to inform him of all regarding my antagonistic position to Rogers and Gron. I had at that time offered Gron half of the commission, which sum he refused. Hence I felt that I had done all in my power to win him and friends, for if Gron had received the offered sum, I would have nothing for myself; not even enough to cover my own debt.

I was therefore so angry with Rogers and Gron that I decided to take no consideration whatsoever of them, and to follow the advice of Mr. LODGE. I worked out a statement, took all my papers, letters, and telegrams, and announced myself to Mr. Hay. Mr. Hay became confused, annoyed, and angry when I had told him what was in my mind. He was confused, because I, a foreigner, had secured such an unfortunate impression of the political conditions in Washington; annoyed because Mr. LODGE had sent me up into the foreign ministry, and angry, or more correctly enraged, against Rogers

JANUARY 18.

and his people. To me he said: "Well, it may be that these 'trust people' are very powerful, but I will show them that they do not yet rule the Administration of this country or its Congress."

Now I felt no more of Gron's machinations, not even through articles in the press. I could now work in peace for the sale of the islands, and use my best efforts.

I had one article after another published in different papers describing the islands, and often illustrated with photographic drafts that I had with me. I point in that connection to my scrapbook, which contains several hundred clippings. I made the acquaintance of many members of Congress, and had now one, now another, either to dine or to supper at Hotel Raleigh, where I lived. It cost me much money, because Washington is one of the most expensive cities in the world—especially the dinners in the hotels were expensive. It was not alone the members of Congress, but their private secretaries that I had to invite. I had as my special assistants two men, C. W. Knox, who was an intimate friend of Senator MARK HANNA, and Richard P. Evans, a lawyer in Washington, who represented Mr. Gardner and his friends in the House. These took an active part in the personal agitation, since they talked with a large number of members of Congress and agitated for the purchase of the islands.

I had contracts with them both, according to which they, and through them certain members of Congress, should have a share of the commission if the sale took place. But the two gentlemen's agitation expenses, etc., bills in restaurants and hotels I had to pay.

In the middle of January I had to procure more money from Denmark, since the amount I had for my journey was entirely exhausted, and, again, before my departure for America I was compelled to have it replenished.

In the meantime work proceeded rapidly in Washington, and I could count that the matter would have the majority both in the Senate and the House (also between the Democrats was a sentiment created for the acquirement of the islands). I was in the happiest frame of mind, since I believed that all the difficulties had at last been overcome, but just then began my very worst troubles.

As already reported, Mr. Brun talked about my dismissal in such a manner that both Mr. Hay, Senator LODGE, and others came to know it. In different ways I noticed that cordiality by which I had been received cooled. My two assistants, Evans and Knox, referred more frequently to the reports that were circulated, and Mr. Knox even sought the minister and had from his own mouth confirmed the frightful news that I had been discharged and disgraced from the Danish navy.

One day Senator LODGE, in his private room at the Senate, asked me how the matter stood, and when I last had an audience with Mr. Hay he asked me the same question. I could not deny the fact that I had been dismissed in disgrace, and my efforts to ameliorate the situation had no effect.

I had become a suspicious person and blackened, and soon my stay in Washington had become impossible for myself as well as for my wife. Both Mr. Hay and Senator LODGE advised me to take my departure, and I decided to do that and to live in New York, from where I could easily run over to Washington when my presence should be necessary.

But a much worse danger threatened to bring me into the most painful situation. I had not yet secured the recognition of my banker, J. & W. Seligman & Co., and I could no longer do without a guarantee for the sums of money I had been obliged to promise. My own financial means were entirely exhausted; I was obliged to live as economically as possible in New York; I could no longer offer money upon the Senators and Members of Congress, and was obliged to let Mr. Knox and Mr. Evans know that I was not able to pay their expenses.

The two press associations, Abner McKinley and Brown, Evans, Knox, and others I had promised that their contracts should be guaranteed by the house of Seligman. To this the banking house had agreed as soon as it should in one way or other be recognized by the Danish Government. I had the prime minister's absolute promise of such a recognition. I had blind confidence in the promise, but it was not kept. Upon my presentation to the prime minister I received only this reply by telegram, which had no signature, but which I conclude was from the minister. It stated: "Letter received, but incomprehensible. Can not give you or S. any authority."

I then studied out that possibly the prime minister would agree to permit a bank guarantee; and since Privatbanken, in Copenhagen, had requested me to ask Seligman to send them the eventual amount of sale (in which connection Seligman had written Privatbanken), it appeared to me reasonable that the minister would rather let Privatbanken take the affair in hand and give Seligman the desired bank guarantee that the American banking house was accepted by the Danish Government.

I wrote, then, February 25, 1900: "Herr Direktor Larsen, Privatbanken, Copenhagen: I have, after agreement with you before my departure from Copenhagen, informed J. & W. Seligman & Co., New York City, who have been accepted by the minister of finance as financiers in the event of the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands to the United States, that Privatbanken, from the Danish side, should handle the affair; and Seligman have with pleasure agreed to that arrangement."

Seligman, in that connection, will, by the next post, send you a letter in which will be referred to the strange fact that the firm has not yet received the official confirmation of the recognition from the minister of finance.

I will therefore request from you after conversation with the minister to assure Seligman that they have actually been accepted, in case a sale takes place.

Seligman at the same time wrote Privatbanken, in order to get a recognition established, and received late in March reply from Direktor Larsen. In that letter the director gave the information that he, after conference with the minister, had received the impression that his excellency regarded your firm as bankers for the American Government, but by no means as acting for the Danish Government. Seligman gave me that letter and I believe that from that moment they looked upon me with suspicion. Was it possible also to explain that I to that degree had been disavowed by the Danish prime minister.

In the month of January my whole efforts had been based upon the clear understanding between myself and the prime minister that Seligman should be the recognized bankers of the Danish Government in the sale, and in March the minister declared to the Direktor of Privatbanken that Seligman had actually nothing to do with the Danish Government.

But even a greater surprise awaited me. In order to get that for me so extremely important recognition of Seligman brought about, I advised the counsel to the banking house to write to my adviser, the lawyer of the Supreme Court, Mr. Salomon, to whom I myself wrote on February 25, 1900.

As I at one time explained to you, I had already before my return home in December disposed of a part of the 10 per cent, and had accepted the bankers, J. & W. Seligman & Co., all upon the supposition that the minister of finance approved both of my future administration of the 10 per cent and of the bankers. As you know, the minister agreed to my proposition. As you will understand, I have had great difficulty in giving actual guaranty for the commission I have promised. I myself have only the minister's word to depend on. That is naturally enough for me, but the Americans refused to accept that as good enough.

Here I have been obliged to place my own person and my personal prop-

erty as security, and, besides, Seligman have, who have absolute confidence in me, placed their highly respected name as guaranty for my administration of the 10 per cent.

The firm now think, as is natural, that the moment has come, under one form or another, to receive confirmation for the fact that the Danish Government actually will use it to finance an eventual sale of the islands. I have, therefore, advised the firm's legal counsel to put himself in touch with you with a view of securing a recognition.

I take it for granted that the minister can not as yet give any official authority, and he has in that matter sent me a telegram, but the affair might be arranged in the same manner as when the minister gave me expense money, viz. through Privatbanken. Direktor Larsen requested me to see that Privatbanken got the business in hand, and I arranged this with Seligman. The sale of the islands will, therefore, be financed by J. & W. Seligman & Co. on this side of the Atlantic and by Privatbanken on the other. In that connection, therefore, it would seem to me that Privatbanken could give the guaranty to Seligman that they could consider themselves the Danish Government's bankers in the affair.

It is very difficult with this "hide and seek" anxiety on the part of the minister. I must have the relation established before it is too late. Seligman ought to have the guaranty that they run no risks in giving guaranties in connection with the 10 per cent, or it will end in their considering me a humbug, in whom they could have no confidence.

Supreme Court Lawyer Salomon, on receipt of his letter, took steps to see the prime minister on my account. As regards the result of the attempt, I received the following telegram:

"MARCH 13, 1900.

"Schlichtkrull, principal, writes indignantly. He won't speak anybody directly or indirectly representing you. Give me explanation."

"SALOMON."

My answer back on the same day was:

"Only explanation, principal crazy."

"CHRISTMAS."

I knew nothing else to answer. I was not only paralyzed from surprise, but entirely confounded by Mr. Salomon's telegram. I had to believe that there was either a mystery or mistake. My brain could not contain the idea that the prime minister who three months ago secured me money for the journey, gave me instructions, had acceded to all my plans and propositions, had shown me the confidence of allowing me to administer as large a sum of money as a tenth of the sum to be paid for the Danish Islands, who, on my departure had pressed my hand in a most cordial manner and wished me "Godspeed"—that he now indignantly refused to talk to anyone who, directly or indirectly, represented me.

And I knew that I had done nothing to which he could take exception. I had offered the best of my ability for the affair. I had talked with several hundred persons, written innumerable articles in the paper, conferred, convinced, bribed, given dinners and suppers, used all my money, borrowed more, and again used it.

But nevertheless this fact was sure: The prime minister would have nothing to do with anyone who represented Captain Christmas.

When I later talked with Supreme Court Lawyer Salomon about the strange situation, he said about the following:

"When I had read the minister's letter I was obliged to believe that you had committed one crime or another over there, or at least a scandal. I knew not what to think."

I had not done anything but to accomplish the work the minister had given me to do. The most remarkable is, however, that after my return when I asked the prime minister why he had written such a letter, if he had anything to complain of regarding me, he answered "No."

In the latter part of February I returned to New York. The affair stood well in Washington, and my only concern was that the Danish Government should sell the islands for less than \$4,000,000. On the 19th of February I wrote Etatsraad Hansen:

"One of my assistants in Washington, who has a position in the State Department, has informed me that a whole series of telegrams has passed between Mr. Hay and the American minister in Copenhagen. It would seem, therefore, that an attempt has been made to reach an understanding as to the sum. I hope Denmark will not sell under \$4,000,000, but rather would wait over the summer. The American Navy can not do without the harbor, and has demanded it of the Administration. It is quite possible that by waiting until the fall the price can be advanced a million. Senator LODGE thinks soon to have the affair ready in the Senate. It is there that I have found the greatest difficulty, since Mr. Rogers, Flindt, etc., had worked energetically to prevent the sale. The opposition, however, now seemed to be overcome, but I had an exceedingly difficult task and am most likely not through with it yet."

"As long as I was personally in Washington my different assistants waited with some patience on the promised guaranties for the contracts I had made with them and worked energetically, but when I had gone back to New York began to express themselves impatiently, and I was requested again and again to let them know if the Government had yet or would soon recognize Seligman. They did not wish to work any longer upon the uncertainties. They were not accustomed to give credit in political matters, etc. In short, my helpers were beginning to go on a strike."

I did not know what in the world to do, and Seligman themselves began to have suspicion on account of that strange delay by the Danish minister of finance to recognize the firm, which had already shown considerable energy and done much work for the Danish Government.

It was at that time, while I, as I have shown above, made such great efforts to get that recognition established with the lamentable result, I became at last so nervous and helpless in my position on account of the many complaints from Washington, and for fear that the whole affair should go to pieces for lack of guaranties, that I, in my distress, accepted help from a quarter where I greatly regretted to look for it.

And here begins the most painful part of my experience in America. I made Advocate Fischer-Hansen my legal adviser and accepted his help. I have been very strongly criticised for that, but I think the criticism should fall upon those who broke their agreement with me and compelled me to act as I did. Carl Fischer-Hansen, who is a Dane by birth, became a lawyer in New York at a very early age, where he has a large law practice. He is a man of ability, but suffers from the most pitiable vanity and desire to make himself observed. I consider him to be inconsiderate in the choice of means and quite unreliable. He is married into a very wealthy family, through whom he has good connections, especially in the White House.

On my first visit in New York I made Fischer-Hansen's acquaintance, and it was he who presented me to Messrs. Abner McKinley and Brown. As soon as he had heard of the island question he wished absolutely to play a part, but after he had committed a number of indiscretions I withdrew as much as possible from him. Through Mr. Abner McKinley, however, I stood always in a certain relation to him, and did not dare to break off for fear that he should become my enemy.

By and by, as the difficulties increased for me regarding getting my guaranty recognized, Mr. Fischer-Hansen became more and more generous in his offers, and the other side, Abner McKinley, pressed me to accept him.

About the last of February I was very badly situated. I could no longer pay Evans and Knox cash. It was still necessary to work with the press, which cost much money. I wished to secure a large model of St. Thomas, which cost several hundred dollars, and should be exhibited in Washington for the purpose of interesting the members of Congress in the islands. Seligman withdrew more and more, and my people in Washington threatened to lay down the work if I could procure no guaranties.

Then came Fischer-Hansen to me one forenoon at the Hotel Manhattan, and offered his and his father-in-law's guaranty for the sums I had promised, until Seligman should be recognized. He promised to pay for a model of St. Thomas referred to and also to furnish the running expenses in Washington and to the press.

Whatever reluctance I might have had, I did not dare, difficult position, to refuse the offer. The only demands Fischer-Hansen made in return were that I to the Danish prime minister should acknowledge him as my legal counsel, to report to the minister his offer, and to promise to work to the end that he might receive a decoration, which was the aim of his ambition.

Fischer-Hansen guaranteed, as promised, several contracts, and in return I reported to the prime minister that I had accepted Fischer-Hansen as my legal counsel in New York, and praised him, as was natural, for his generous offer. I refer in that relation to my report to the prime minister dated February 26, 1900.

In the meantime a great struggle had sprung up in Congress which lasted for a long time. The fight was about the Porto Rico tariff, and the result of the contest played an important part as the Danish West Indian Islands' future might fare in the same way as Porto Rico. That island had up to the present been kept outside of the American tariff limit, and its economical situation was very bad. The President desired to give Porto Rico free trade, the Democratic party also, but the large sugar trust company opposed it as harmful to the interests of the company. After a long time an agreement was arrived at upon a basis of 15 per cent tariff, which compromise satisfied none of the parties.

I had in the beginning of March a meeting with Mr. Bryan, the Democratic party's candidate to the Presidency. Mr. Bryan had made a number of political speeches in the different large cities in America, and came also to Philadelphia. He agitated especially against McKinley's imperialistic policy, and I was afraid that he might oppose the purchase of the Danish West Indies. Mr. C. W. Knox obtained for me a meeting with Mr. Bryan in a train between Baltimore and Philadelphia. I had a ten minutes' conversation with him, and secured his assurance that he would not oppose the sale. Mr. Bryan considered the purchase of the islands as a military strategic necessity which had nothing whatever to do with politics.

That evening, in a speech before the Philadelphia Democratic Club, Mr. Bryan confirmed his position as regards that question. He said he would always fight against imperialism and militarism, which he considered as synonymous; and said he could always sympathize with a peaceful extension, and especially a rounding off of the Republic within our own waters, as that was specially to protect our own coasts and islands. Together with the discussions about the Porto Rico tariff was the Nicaragua Canal treaty. Mr. Hay and the English ambassador, Pauncefoot, had signed the treaty according to which the proposed Nicaragua Canal could not be fortified. That angered a large portion of the Americans, and there was a strong sentiment against Mr. Hay.

I mention this question because, like the Porto Rico tariff, it touched the fate of the Danish Islands. While the Democrats demanded that the Nicaragua Canal should be fortified, the Republicans, with Senator Lodge in the lead, insisted that that was not necessary, since the canal could be protected from the islands lying about, by establishing strong naval stations in the right places. Not one but many times came the advocates of the treaty back to this point, and showed how the canal could be protected on the west from some islands in the Pacific; on the east from the Danish Islands. I have in my scrapbook numerous articles from the papers touching on this question, and it is quite remarkable to see how the American politicians already at that time looked upon the Danish Islands as the best place to establish American fortifications.

It would of course have been of great value to me to have been kept informed of what took place in Denmark regarding the island affair, but I never heard a word beyond a few scattered newspaper articles. In the beginning of March, however, I received a letter from Mr. Hagemann, and by reading that I first began to realize that opposition to the sale might be found in Denmark. I knew, however, that the Danish Government had formally agreed to a transfer to the United States Government, and since I had received no command to stop my work I simply continued.

I have never known what during that time took place in Denmark regarding the sale beyond what a few Congressmen told me.

It is sure that the Danish Government would not have found any difficulty in putting the affair through, since in America at least, no material opposition would have appeared. In Congress there was a majority for obtaining the islands. The Administration desired that extension of the United States. The military department demanded outright the islands as necessary for the country's security, and all the papers of any importance over the whole Union had expressed themselves as favoring the affair. The only dangerous opponents, viz, Rogers and his friends, had been brought to silence.

I dare here express, without in any way running the risk of being criticised for self-praise, that all of this favorable situation for the affair which, by the way still exists, is the direct result of my own work, and it is far from that this work had been made easy for me since, on the contrary, great oppositions had been placed in the way by the syndicate, by the Danish minister, yes, and not the least, by the Danish prime minister.

It is therefore not without a feeling of bitterness that I, on the 13th of March, wrote the prime minister:

"With this I could terminate my communication, but I consider it my duty to add some remarks which will assist in giving your excellency a fair comprehension as to how my position has been over here since I last left Denmark. Your excellency did me the honor at one of our meetings to inform me that you had written a lengthy letter to the Danish minister in Washington; informed him as to the progress of the affair, and as to my early return to America. I had absolute reason to believe that that communication from your excellency should serve me as a sort of an official credential, so that I not only would be able to count upon the assistance of the minister in the interest of the affair, but should also be in a position to give to my banker in New York a semi-official confirmation that he had been accepted by the Danish Government, since such a confirmation should have taken place through a personal meeting between the minister and the chief of the house of I. & W. Seligman & Co.

"As I have previously had the honor to inform your excellency, Mr. Brun would scarcely admit that he had received the letter referred to. He would only look upon me as a chance tourist. Nor has it in any way assisted me that Mr. Brun's conception of me and my position was transplanted to the foreign minister in Washington, where previously I have been treated with much regard and confidence. Mr. Brun's treatment of me has caused me an endless amount of worry and difficulty, which I shall not further elaborate upon. It must be permitted, with all due consideration, that I express my surprise that I have thus been obliged without avail to seek assistance in this

important affair, which both your excellency and a large portion of the Danish people desire to have terminated as quickly as possible. It has now for nearly three years been clear both to your excellency and to the committee of the highest Danish patriots, which was formed for the purpose of accomplishing the sale of the Danish West Indian Islands, that such a political action could not be put through in America without paying a large sum of money.

"I can, after my experience, absolutely confirm that conception as being right. Since no official representative of the Danish Government could undertake to administer the amount of money necessary for accomplishing the sale, a private person had to do it, and it became my task to accomplish that unpleasant and by no means easy task; but from difficult it became almost impossible for me, since I had neither cash money nor guaranties to offer the persons whom it was necessary to interest in the affair. I had, therefore, surely depended that I should have been able to use a banker as guarantor for the sums I had to offer in case the affair was accomplished, but in that regard I had not been backed up from home."

That communication I was obliged to dictate to my wife while lying in bed ill from nervousness and provocation over the treatment which I had received from the prime minister.

From private letters and newspaper articles from Denmark, and especially after receiving the supreme court lawyer Salomon's telegram, I understood that a sentiment against the sale of the islands was springing up in Denmark; also that Horrings's ministry would soon be dissolved. I decided, therefore, to return home as soon as Privatbanken's reply to Seligman's should arrive, because upon that I based my last hope that the prime minister would keep his promise to recognize the banker.

The reply arrived, as already stated, early in April, and with that my last hope was banished.

The Danish Rigsdag would soon close, and in the American Congress the coming Presidential campaign had already begun to absorb all interest. Hence it was easily recognizable that the sale of the islands could not be terminated before the next Congress—that is, after the 4th of December, 1900.

I had already in several letters and reports, for example, in my letter to Etatsraad G. Hansen, on 19th February—expressed this eventuality, and I had even advised sooner to wait the summer over, as thereby it might be possible to increase the sum \$1,000,000.

Before I left America, however, it was of the highest importance that I should come to a definite understanding with Rogers and Gron, as I did not dare to leave the country with those two as enemies.

I attempted, therefore, again to get Gron to agree to a compromise, but that was very difficult. He and Rogers evidently did not think there was any possibility that the sale of the islands would take place before the following session, and it was then their intention to manage with me out, so that they themselves, assisted by their friends in Copenhagen, could arrange the latter in accordance with their own interests.

To that I was naturally opposed, since I had not only done a great and important work in the matter and sacrificed a large sum of money in trying to accomplish it, but I had also to consider other persons who had rendered me much assistance both in Congress and in the press, and those persons would without doubt, if they saw their demands neglected and their interests threatened, work just as strongly against the affair as they had before for it.

For about a fortnight I had worked in New York to the end of arriving at a compromise, but did not succeed. In the meantime I was notable, from pecuniary reasons, to remain longer in New York. I was absolutely obliged to depart before I became so reduced that I should not be able to pay my passage home for my wife and myself. An attempt to secure money from Denmark through Mr. Hagemann failed.

I could therefore see no other means, in my difficult position, than to compel Gron to compromise. My feelings toward him and Rogers were not of the kindest, since they had done me all the harm they could and had not been select in their choice of weapons.

Before I did anything I sought Mr. Gron and informed him of my decision. These transactions with Gron and Rogers had to come to an end, and if they would not willingly accept my offer, which, in generosity, was much greater than the two gentlemen could expect or demand, then I would in one of New York's largest papers make public their opposition to me in the island affair, their misuse of the press, etc.; in short, scandalize them to such a degree as they for months had tried to scandalize me. My offer to Gron consisted in that he and Rogers during their present session of Congress should have half of the commission, but if the islands first were sold during the coming winter session they could have two-thirds and one-third of the commission. The day after Gron sent to me a refusal of the offer.

I then went to the editor in chief of the World, Colonel Vanbenheisen, and made him acquainted with my difficult situation. He understood immediately, and offered to assist me. I gave Mr. Vanbenheisen a short account of the whole affair of my relations with Rogers and Gron, handed over to him a number of letters, telegrams, and other documents, and made him promise that he would publish nothing without my permission. Advocate Fischer-Hansen was witness to our conversation, which he, by the way, himself had brought about, since he personally knew Colonel Vanbenheisen.

My intention was not to have anything made public, since that would only produce scandal, without any way furthering the affair. I only wished to frighten Gron, and especially Rogers.

I must here explain that no paper can make public an article giving names of persons without first presenting such an article's head points and assertions. In such a case the editor sends some one to the person and presents him a résumé of the article's contents, and allows the person to protest against it if he wishes. Those press conditions had been explained to me by Fischer-Hansen, and upon that I had built my hopes of being able to force Rogers to give in when he should see that there was danger that I would actually follow up my threats. Besides, I must explain that the World is especially feared by the large trust companies, which the paper fights with all its power, as detrimental to the middle class. Mr. Rogers is, besides, the very blackest sheep in all the trusts, since he is the most inconsiderate operator, with the enormous fortune of the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. Vanbenheisen kept his promise, sent a reporter to Mr. Rogers, and afterwards to Mr. Gron, and the result was the desired one. The day after Gron, in his own and Rogers's name, signed a contract with me, after which half of the sum should fall to him and Rogers if the islands were sold during the present session, two-thirds if the sale took place during the coming winter session. As soon as the contract was signed, Mr. Fischer-Hansen secured me back all my papers, letters, etc., from Colonel V., who kept his word and never made public a line of what I had given him in confidence.

That affair was therefore, in my opinion, out of the world when I returned to Denmark, but unfortunately there awaited me an afterplay. About three weeks after my departure the paper, New York Times, published a long article against Rogers in connection with his relation to the sale of the islands.

A part of that article has been published in the Politikan, and I have answered it. It was not clear to me from where the article originated and who had inspired it. I had left no material behind. In the beginning I thought

that it was from the foreign minister, to break a possible opposition in the Senate to the island sale. The minister of war held warlike speeches, in which he demanded the islands. Now he is believed to understand better, but what it all is about he can not be blamed more than the man who has fallen as an offer for thieves and bandits. Gron has here in this country blamed Fischer-Hansen as the author.

Before I left Fischer-Hansen desired to be liberated from some of the obligations he had given as guarantor of my contracts, and I complied with his desire, so much the more as I had never wished to make use of his help. I was only compelled to do so by circumstances, because I set the affair over all personal wishes and considerations.

Those persons and press associations who previously were my assistants are still. I have reduced the different sums of which I am now the only guarantor in such a way that I can now manage to get along with a third of the commission promised me. That I did in order to be able to give the gentlemen, Rogers and Gron, the large amount—two-thirds of the 10 per cent commission—which they demanded.

After my return to Denmark I applied to the chief of department Schlichtkrull and requested him to inquire of the prime minister when I could secure an audience. The minister asked me to call the day after, and I met.

I had not seen the minister since my departure from Denmark in January, and it was in a bitter frame of mind that I again entered the minister's reception room in the ministry of finance. I had in the meantime worked to such a degree that my nerves were almost ruined and my means entirely exhausted. I had not saved myself, but thrown my whole energy into the affair, which the minister had shown such a lively interest for. In return the minister had done nothing for me. He had broken his promises and agreements, even to such a degree that he had proven untrue to me and had made it appear that I had made myself impossible for the minister's confidence. (See prime ministers letter to Salomon.)

The audience terminated for both parties in a very unpleasant manner, and my bitterness and anger ran away with me, and I reproached the minister for his failure to keep his word and remain loyal to me.

The minister admitted that perhaps in his letter to Salomon he had expressed himself too strongly. When I asked him if he had had anything to reproach me for, he answered no.

I permitted myself to make it clear to him how he, by refusing to back me up, had made it possible for Mr. Brun to drive me out of Washington; how I had there only worked according to the agreement between myself and the minister, but had been left in the lurch, had been made suspicious, and mocked; how the minister had been the fault of making my best friends in America, such as Seligman and Senator Lodge, look upon me with suspicion; how I had been jeered at in Denmark, and called various names, etc., without the minister having done anything toward assisting me; on the contrary, he had betrayed me and disavowed me each time he found an opportunity. I asked the minister to think it all over, and requested urgently that he should secure for me satisfaction. His excellency had only this reply—that it was not in his power to give me any satisfaction; that he only had a couple more days to remain minister in.

CONCLUSION.

I have above given a detailed and accurate account of my work in the island affair. How that evolves itself in the future I do not know, but I permit myself here to establish the absolutely undeniable fact that it is I and my personal work that is the cause of the Americans' interest in the islands and their desire to buy them.

[Here a page is lost.]

Justice and to the enlightenment of all the relations upon which I base this desire is this: That I have permitted myself to trouble the high Government with this presentation of my work in the affair in question.

With the highest obedience,

W. CHRISTMAS DIRCKINCK HOLMFELDT.

FARUNGAARD, October 1, 1900.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12804.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEMENWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12804.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Virginia was to have twenty-five minutes' debate on the bill.

Mr. HAY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HULL. I hardly think that was the agreement. I submit to my friend from Virginia if that was not with the understanding that he was to discuss the bill, and that he was not quite ready to proceed with his remarks yesterday. That was the understanding, was it not?

Mr. HAY. I did not so understand. I wanted forty-five minutes; and I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York, and then I will not take any time myself.

Mr. HULL. It was not a question of time; it is a question of the understanding that was made. If the gentleman will say that that was not his understanding, of course I will raise no objection.

Mr. HAY. I do not want you to have any misunderstanding.

Mr. HULL. Well, I will leave it to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. HAY. I am between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from New York. I do not want to do anything discourteous to either one. I do not propose to make any remarks myself. I just yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HULL. Go ahead.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I sent to

the Clerk's desk an article from the Philadelphia North American dated March 14, 1902, which I desired to have read. At that time it was objected to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DICK]. I now send to the Clerk the same paper to have the article read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From Philadelphia North American, March 14, 1902.]

REPRESENTATIVE SULZER INTRODUCES A BILL INTENDED TO REFORM PRESENT TARIFF LAW—AIMS BLOW AT SUGAR TRUST—WOULD REMOVE COLOR RESTRICTION AND OPEN MARKET TO CUBAN PRODUCERS.

[By Angus McSweeney.]

WASHINGTON, March 13, 1902.

The North American's exposure of sugar-trust methods is having its effect.

Representative SULZER, of New York, to-day introduced in the House a bill to amend the present tariff law by striking from the sugar schedule the provision that all sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, shall pay a duty of 1½ cents a pound.

This action was based directly upon the statements in the North American of Tuesday showing the enormous protection given the sugar trust by the color restriction in the tariff law and the palpable deception practiced by Congress, both by its insertion in the law and by its retention there.

As its author is a member of the Democratic minority, Mr. SULZER's bill will be scoffed at by the members of the Ways and Means Committee, but it will serve as a beginning of the investigation which should be demanded by the country, and which should lead to favorable action upon the bill as soon as the purposes aimed at are generally understood.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and it is before that committee now. Mr. SULZER expects to obtain his first hearing and a hearing also for the witnesses he will produce to testify in behalf of his proposition.

Except by reports of the trust interests, it is not easy to see how objections to the bill can be successfully argued. It proposes no reduction in the rates of duty established by existing law upon sugar according to its grade of purity, and leaves the duty of 1½ cents a pound upon refined sugar, but eliminates the color restriction and opens the way to the sugar producers of Cuba to send their highest grades of sugar to the United States for sale in the markets in competition with sugar-trust products.

Of course, the measure will be opposed by the trust and by all trust advocates in Congress, but there is no sentiment outside the two legislative Chambers in favor of trust privileges, and sooner or later SULZER's proposition will be accepted. The North American has aroused the spirit of inquiry, and nothing more is needed to expose the trick by which the trust has secured absolute control of the sugar market. Mr. SULZER said to-day respecting his measure:

"Everyone must admit that the whole usefulness of the Dutch standard lies in the fact that, first, it forces the planters to sell exclusively to the trust, and second, of course, it forces the people to buy exclusively of the trust. It is merely a means of assuring to the trust an absolute monopoly in the sugar business. The Cubans, who would be glad to market their sugars direct and pay the higher duties, which will be required according to a really scientific test, are unable to do so, and the people of the United States, who would be glad to buy their sugar direct from the producers, are unable to do so."

"Ingenuity of man could not have devised a more perfect and admirable method of securing for a limited number of capitalists an absolute monopoly of an important article of food than this one which lies hidden in that apparently innocent color restriction. It helps nobody but the trust, it keeps the planters poor, and it robs the people. All this can be easily proved, and that is what I purpose to do. It was because I was certain of it that I introduced the bill."

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the article just read is from one of the most fearless, one of the most honest, and one of the greatest Republican newspapers in this country, the Philadelphia North American. The article speaks for itself. I have had it read from the Clerk's desk so that it will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that every member of this House will take the trouble to read it.

The article clearly, fully, and intelligently tells the purpose of the bill I introduced in this House on the 13th day of this month. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee by the Speaker, and I request, and indulge the hope, that it will ere long be favorably reported.

Let me reiterate what I have frequently said before on this floor, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of Cuba and of the Cubans. The record will show that ever since I have been a member of this House I have done all in my power for the Cuban people. I am glad the bright day is not far distant when the Cuban Republic will take her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquillity abide with her hereafter forever, is my fervent prayer. [Applause.]

The time is at hand, nevertheless, when we must live up to our sacred obligations to Cuba. We must grant her the freedom and the independence promised. We must launch this young Republic of Cuba on the ocean of nations and say to all the world, Cuba is free and independent. We must say to every nation, She is our creation—a daughter of the great Republic—and any interference with her will be an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. We must now grant her immediate trade relief. In a commercial way she is at our mercy. That is not her fault—it is our fault. Congress has made it practically impossible for Cuba to market her products in other countries; they must be sold here, and they can not be sold in this country at present except at a ruinous loss, unless our tariff law is repealed or modified. This must be done at once—it

should have been done months ago. If it is not speedily done I predict that conditions in Cuba will soon be worse than they ever were before. The situation is serious and admits of no further delay. The people want Congress to act.

The Republican party is responsible for the deplorable commercial condition now existing in Cuba. The Republican party, wedded to its high protective-tariff policy, would apparently rather witness the starvation of the Cubans than consent to reduce to a slight degree for Cuba its present system of outrageous tariff taxes. What a spectacle of commercial selfishness, monopolistic greed, and political shortsightedness the Republican party presents to-day! We have been in session here since the first Monday of last December, and nothing has been done to afford relief to the Cubans.

The President, the Secretary of War, General Wood, President-elect Palma, and every person familiar with the present situation in Cuba have urged Congress to reduce the existing tariff taxes on Cuban exports to this country at least 50 per cent. But nothing has been done. The Republican leaders can not agree, the Ways and Means Committee will not act, and the industrial arm of Cuba is becoming paralyzed. I predict that if this selfish policy is continued much longer the doctrine of Republican protection will soon be destroyed by its foolish worshippers.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of doing something now to avert calamity in Cuba. I want to see Cuba free and happy and prosperous. I will vote for any measure to reduce the present tariff duties between this country and Cuba. In my judgment we should have free trade with Cuba. It would be beneficial to us and advantageous to the Cubans. It would help the people of both countries.

But I say now, and it must be apparent to anyone who gives the subject consideration, that if relief comes by tariff reduction the present duties must be reduced at least one-half. Anything less in this line will be useless and futile, and Cuba will go back to a condition of commercial stagnation that will cost us dearly in the end, and the fault will be all our own.

In the last three years the balance of trade has been over \$30,000,000 against the island. Her people have exhausted their resources in a heroic struggle to build up their industries, but they can not go on spending more than they receive any longer, and this year's sugar crop, which will be over 800,000 tons, represents their supreme effort, and unless relief comes—and comes quickly—we must expect a crisis which will render Cuba's position most deplorable and ours most embarrassing.

A mere handful of protected beet growers and cane growers, who care nothing for Cuba, nothing for the millions of American sugar consumers, are the only obstructors of this nation's good will to the people of Cuba. The American people expect Congress to grant relief, and to grant it quickly.

When the Congress adopted the so-called Platt amendment, which I voted against, and which in my judgment never should have been adopted, it took an unfair advantage of Cuba; but when that amendment finally became a law, the Cuban people accepted it in good faith, and, at our request, wrote it into their constitution. By virtue of that amendment Cuba is commercially helpless to-day, and unable to make treaties of a commercial character to market her products. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that it is now incumbent on this Government to grant some trade relief to Cuba by which her products can be admitted into this country and sold without a loss. At present this can not be done.

The cost of raising sugar in Cuba is 2.6 cents per pound. The selling price of sugar, duty paid, in New York is now 3.75 cents. The Dingley duty is 1.68½ cents per pound, or nearly 100 per cent of its value on the plantation in Cuba. It plainly appears, therefore, that Cuba can only sell her staple crop in New York at a loss, and can not sell it anywhere else. There is now about \$20,000,000 worth of sugar cane standing in Cuba, and if the Dingley blockade against it is not raised it might as well be left to rot on the ground.

Governor-General Leonard Wood, pleading for a speedy reciprocal arrangement, insists that this country has nothing to lose and much to gain thereby. Our domestic production of sugar is about 450,000 tons; in the annexed and protected islands, Cuba included, about 1,000,000 tons more are grown, and from Europe we buy about 800,000 tons besides. One-fifth of all the sugar the American people use must come from outside. Cuba's total product, even if it were greatly increased, could not possibly make us independent of Europe.

Now, sir, if I could have my way regarding the matter I would strike down every tariff barrier between the Republic of Cuba and the United States. If something is not quickly done by Congress that will be the solution. The leaders of the Republican party have been quarreling day in and day out regarding this question. I am now informed and believe they have reached an agreement by which they are willing to reduce the existing tariff

duties 20 per cent on sugar and tobacco. That according to the President, the Secretary of War, General Wood, President Palma, of the Cuban Republic, and others competent to testify, will do absolutely no good. If there is going to be any reduction of the tariff law, the reduction must be 50 per cent or more in order to help the Cubans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few words regarding my bill to remove the color restriction on unrefined sugar coming from Cuba. I introduced the bill in good faith, and I intend to do all in my power to pass it. It is a good bill, and should become a law. There should be no opposition to it, and to some extent it will solve the present difficulty by permitting the Cuban planters to market their unrefined sugar product immediately in this country. That will afford some relief at once.

If the color restriction on Cuban unrefined sugar should be removed, it would not materially injure the beet-sugar growers nor the cane-sugar growers of this country, but it would benefit immediately the Cuban planters and furnish to the people of this country cheaper and better sugar.

At present, on account of this color restriction, put in the law by the sugar trust, every pound of unrefined sugar that comes from Cuba to this country must be sold to the sugar trust, and it must be sold to the trust at the trust's own price. If this bill to remove that restriction should become a law, the Cuban sugar planters, if they were unable to sell to the sugar trust, could market their product and sell it to grocers and consumers in competition with the sugar trust.

The only legitimate opposition to this bill must therefore come from the sugar trust, in order to control the product, dictate the price, and stifle competition. When this question is understood, I am satisfied every friend of the people, every foe of monopoly, and every believer in commercial justice will favor the bill.

Now, sir, I do not say this bill is all that is necessary at the present time, but I do say, and I challenge successful contradiction, that it is a step in the right direction, and will afford immediate relief not only to the tariff-taxed Cuban producer, but also to the trust-taxed American consumer.

The color restriction on sugar is a device of the sugar trust and was put in the Dingley high protective tariff law at the instigation of the sugar trust, to give it a monopoly in this country on refined sugars. Remove the color restriction and the higher grade Cuban sugars can be put on the American market at once and sold in competition with the refined sugars of the trust.

At present the color restriction on sugar in the law forces the producers of Cuban sugar to sell to the trust at the price fixed by the trust, and compels the consumers in America to buy from the trust at the price dictated by the trust. The trust controls the product and fixes the price to suit itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get this matter before the House. I have done so briefly. At some future time I shall discuss this question more fully and at greater length. This color restriction for monopoly will have to go. The Republican party must repeal it or admit it stands for monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated shall be disbursed and accounted for by the Pay Department as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. HULL. Under instruction of the committee, I move to amend by inserting after the word "appropriated," in line 25, page 14, the words "for pay of the Army and miscellaneous."

Allow me to explain, Mr. Chairman, that in the making up of this bill for the last four or five years several items have gotten into the first part of the bill (following the lines of the estimate) that are not under the control of the Pay Department. This amendment should be adopted for the purpose of keeping distinct what belongs to the Pay Department and what belongs to other branches of the service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Regular supplies: Regular supplies of the Quartermaster's Department, including their care and protection, consisting of stoves and heating apparatus required for heating offices, hospitals, barracks, and quarters, and recruiting stations; also ranges and stoves and appliances for cooking and serving food, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; of fuel and lights for enlisted men, including recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, and offices, and for sale to officers; and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries; for the necessary furniture, text-books, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; of forage in kind for the horses, mules, and oxen of the Quartermaster's Department at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; of straw for soldiers' bedding, and of stationery, including blank books for the Quartermaster's Department, certificates for discharged soldiers, blank forms for the Pay and Quartermaster's

Department's, and for printing department orders and reports, \$5,500,000; *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations for the Quartermaster's Department shall be expended on printing unless the same shall be done by contract after due notice and competition, except in such cases as the emergency will not admit of the giving notice of competition; and in cases where it is impracticable to have the necessary printing done by contract the same may be done, with the approval of the Secretary of War, by the hire of the necessary labor for the purpose: *Provided further*, That hereafter, except in cases of emergency or where it is impracticable to secure competition, the purchase of all supplies for the use of the various departments and posts of the Army and of the branches of the Army service shall only be made after advertisement, and shall be purchased where the same can be purchased the cheapest, quality and cost of transportation and the interests of the Government considered; but every open-market emergency purchase made in the manner common among business men which exceeds in amount \$300 shall be reported for approval to the Secretary of War under such regulations as he may prescribe.

Mr. HULL. By the instruction of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "bakeries," in line 23, page 17, insert the following: "for ice machines and their maintenance, where required for the health and comfort of the troops in the insular possessions."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BELLAMY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. I was very much interested in the very just and glowing tribute paid yesterday to the valor of American soldiers by my friend from Ohio [Mr. WARNOCK], and I have been even more interested in the table of casualties—as inserted in this morning's RECORD—that were sustained by the various armies on both sides in the great struggle between the North and the South.

I come, as you are aware, sir, from the Old North State, which has for its motto *Esse quam videre*. That motto expresses a striking characteristic of our people, but the modesty of North Carolina will never permit her interests to suffer, when her sons are apprised of an occasion when even unintentionally she is deprived of her merited glory. She was the next to the last State to go into and form the present Union; and yet so devoted was she to it that when she once gave her heart and hand to it she was the last State to reluctantly withdraw from it. And when she, with sorrow, decided to break away from the old Union, she dedicated her all to the new Confederacy, and became the first to lose the life of a son, at Bethel, and was the last to lay down her arms, at Appomattox. And, sir, she contributed more soldiers to the lost cause than did any one of her sisters. But she accepts the arbitrament of war, and now vies with her sisters in her loyalty and devotion to her first love, but treasures with pride and sacred reverence the conspicuous part she bore in the "lost cause."

In the table of statistics that the gentleman gives will be found that he put at the head a Texas regiment as having sustained the greatest loss during the war. Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact that the regiment that sustained the greatest casualties in deaths and wounds in that great battle of Gettysburg was the Twenty-sixth North Carolina Regiment, which lost 90 per cent of its men and its gallant colonel, Harry Burgwyn; and the Second North Carolina Battalion took into that great engagement 200 men, of whom there was not one who was not killed or wounded.

In all history, Mr. Chairman, from Plataea and Marathon to Spion Kop, there is nothing to equal it for courage and endurance; and that the future historian may not omit from the records of time this brilliant achievement, never before equaled in the world's history, I simply refer to this well-established fact to-day in order that he may make up an accurate account of the valor of our troops in that great and sanguinary struggle and give the proper credit to the modest but great State that I have the honor to represent and love so well.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barracks and quarters: For barracks and quarters for troops, storehouses for the safe-keeping of military stores, for offices, recruiting stations, and for the hire of buildings and grounds for summer cantonments, and for temporary buildings at frontier stations, for the construction of temporary buildings and stables, and for repairing public buildings at established posts, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the moneys so appropriated shall be paid for commutation of fuel or for quarters to officers or enlisted men: *Provided further*, That the number of and total sum paid for civilian employees in the Quartermaster's Department, including those paid from the funds appropriated for regular supplies, incidental expenses, barracks and quarters, Army transportation, clothing, camp and garrison equipage, shall be limited to the actual requirements of the service, and that no employee paid therefrom shall receive a salary of more than \$150 per month, except upon the approval of the Secretary of War.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLMSTED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. ROSE, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the conclusion of the paragraph just read insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be instructed to authorize the reestablishment and restoration of the Army canteen as it existed under the rules in force previous to its abolition by Congress: *And be it further provided*, That the provisions of all acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order that this is new legislation and not in order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment evidently changes existing law, and is therefore subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the proper shelter and protection of officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States lawfully on duty in the Philippine Islands, to be expended in the discretion of the President, and to be immediately available, \$1,500,000; and the President is directed to report a detailed statement of the expenditure of this sum to each session of Congress until the entire appropriation is expended.

Mr. CANNON. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I wish to occupy only a moment. In my judgment this item, under the rules of the House, belongs upon the sundry civil bill and not upon the Army appropriation bill. But I have not deemed it proper to make a point of order upon it because I apprehend that the appropriation ought to be made. I call attention to the matter now merely for the purpose of preventing this being cited in the future as a precedent.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the appropriation embraced in this paragraph is in addition to the \$500,000 heretofore appropriated for the same purpose in the urgent deficiency bill. Of course it is a necessary appropriation and I have no word of opposition to offer to it. But I wish to challenge the attention of the House and the country to the fact that this same item may be expected to appear in the Army appropriation bill at every session for an indefinite period in the future. The purpose to which the money will be devoted possesses great significance. This money will be expended in adding to the vast number of military posts scattered throughout the Philippines so thickly as to beleaguer the archipelago with American bayonets. These military posts tell the whole story. They typify the form of government under which henceforth the people of the islands must live.

I have said on this floor and I repeat it now that as long as we stay there we will dominate only the portion of the Philippine Islands commanded by the guns of our Army. Retire our soldiers and the people will reclaim their own and take possession of their country. I have forgotten the number of military posts now in existence in the islands, but it is a far greater number than ever existed on this continent. Without definite knowledge of statistics, I will venture to say that we now have in the Philippines a greater number of military posts than ever existed in the entire Western Hemisphere at any time in its history. This bill provides for more, and we will need them. In order to coerce the people into submission we must police the islands from one end to the other with soldiers. In order to compel respect for our authority the people must constantly look into the muzzles of our guns or see the gleam of our bayonets.

The gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, the Chief Executive, and some of the great newspapers assure the country that presently the Army will be withdrawn from the Philippines and that civil government will be instituted there. This done, they will tell us that a small force—ten or twelve or fifteen thousand soldiers—will suffice. They are deceiving themselves. Whatever its form or name, the government will rely upon the military for support. It will be a government of force, a government at variance with every principle of the American Constitution, a government at variance with every idea of the American people, a government such as American orators and American writers have from the foundation of our Government down to this hour denounced as infamous, because it will not rest upon the consent of the people. There are probably 5,000,000 Christians in that island. In order to justify the policy of our Government they are continually represented as barbarians.

Even if they were barbarians, would that justify us in crossing an ocean to subjugate them and despoil them of their country; to say that wherever a barbarous people may be found an American squadron and an American army shall be sent forth to conquer the country? But the Christian Filipinos are not barbarians. They are not our equals as a race nor in intelligence. The Malay can never approach the attainments of the great races of Europe and the North American Continent. Probably they can never have a government like ours.

Every government is a reflection of the intelligence and capacity

of the people who are its subjects. Establish whatever government you may over any people, and in the long run it will be no better than the people themselves. The form of government, its methods, and its efficiency depend upon the people themselves. The Philippine Islanders, I assert again, as I have asserted frequently on this floor, had a better government than most countries have before we interfered with them. Withdraw our armies tomorrow and they will have a better government than we can give them. They will have a government capable of protecting life and property and guaranteeing the peace of the citizens.

After over two years of active campaigning, during which our Army has created a reign of terror in the island of Luzon, destroying the habitations of the people, laying waste the country, terrorizing the inhabitants, and now you say the country is pacified. I said yesterday, and I repeat it, terrorized is the word. The people have been terrorized into submission, but not pacified. Now, in order to retain what has been won by the use of fire and sword, we must build barracks and garrisons there with soldiers as a constant admonition to the Filipinos that resistance is hopeless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. HULL. I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to print his remarks.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; let him have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. HULL. I shall not object to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am exceedingly obliged to the gentleman from Iowa for not objecting. The gentleman asks that my remarks be printed. They will be printed, and more remarks of the same kind will be printed, not only at this session, but at future sessions of Congress, because more appropriations of the same kind will be asked. The War Department will be here at the next session asking more millions to build more fortresses, to establish more outposts in the Philippines. As long as we remain in the Philippine Islands, at session after session we will be compelled to make these appropriations. Congress must appropriate this money, because nobody here desires to deprive the soldiers in that island of anything necessary to their comfort, and I see no reason to expect a reduction in the amount demanded from year to year. I am one of the number who believe that it is better to keep a large army there than a small one if we are to retain in our hands permanently the government of this distant foreign country. Then at the very outset let us accept the responsibility and discharge it without flinching.

We must do as England has done in her colonies. We must keep in the islands constantly a sufficient number of soldiers to strike terror to the hearts of those people and hold them in unquestioning submission to our authority.

It is futile and hopeless, it is spitting in the face of all history, to expect that we can secure acquiescence in our government of the islands in any other way.

Gentlemen talk about pacifying the country. They were talking in this same strain two years ago. Long, long before General Otis left Manila he reported that the islands were just about pacified. Others who have gone there in official capacity, and still others who have gone there to be entertained and wine and dined at military headquarters in Manila while writing for American newspapers and magazines, have said: "The war is over and the country is pacified." Then in ten or twelve days afterwards we have heard of skirmishes in the very suburbs of Manila.

Recently, after having read reports and statements from all kinds of official and unofficial sources that the war in the Philippines had been terminated, that there were nothing but a few bands of robbers and marauders in the field, it became necessary for General Bell to issue an order sweeping 16,000 people into one concentration camp and 9,000 into another. So desperate was the situation that one of our commanders adopted the very tactics of Weyler in Cuba and of Kitchener in South Africa, and cleared a wide area of its inhabitants. Strange, is it not, that such drastic measures should be deemed necessary after we have been told over and over again, even in President's messages, that the Philippine war is over.

Only one course is left open to us. We must restore the country to its people or keep a force there strong enough to fairly gridiron the country with military roads and punctuate it at frequent intervals with military outposts. Thus we can hold the people in subjection. It can be done in no other way.

As I have said before, this appropriation will have to be made. So will another be necessary next year and the year after, and when we get through what will we have to show for the outlay? We may benefit a few Americans who want to get rich quickly

without work, exploiting the natural resources of the Philippine Islands. We may help promoters of all kinds of fanciful corporations organized to develop gold mines, quarries, coal mines, and forests. All the various resources of the islands may be, and probably will be, seized and appropriated by speculators, to the end that a few men may get rich, or make the effort; meantime the American taxpayer will foot the bill. No American boy will ever go there to get a farm. Few Americans will ever go there to seek employment. No man can go there and, in that pestilential climate, make his home and rear his family. No Americans will expatriate themselves for the purpose of going into a country the inhabitants of which are citizens of nowhere, with no sovereign except the bayonet, and owing allegiance to no country that has a name in history.

At the outset we were compelled to outlaw those islands. They are not a part of our nation. They are not a nation. Where, then, is their allegiance? When a Filipino boy arrives at the age of manhood, where shall he address the devotions of a patriot? To the United States? He is not a citizen of the United States! To the Philippine Islands? They have been blotted out as an entity by the American Government.

Build your outposts, quarter your army there, go on with this scheme of conquest and spoliation, but let it be understood distinctly that you are carrying out a permanent policy.

Every gentleman on the other side of the Chamber has reached the conclusion long ago that military force must be the permanent basis of government in the Philippine Islands, but the Republican leaders have not dared to say so to the country. We all know that there is not in the islands any class of people who are loyal to our Government, but that on the contrary the inhabitants are united in opposition to our sovereignty. The pretense that any considerable number of them are loyal to our flag must be abandoned. There are no loyal Filipinos. The country is committed irrevocably to the policy of military despotism in the Antipodes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of the Army and its supplies: Transportation of the Army, including baggage of the troops when moving either by land or water, and including also the transportation of recruits and recruiting parties heretofore paid from the appropriation for "Expenses for recruiting;" of supplies to the militia furnished by the War Department; of the necessary agents and employees; of clothing, camp and garrison equipage, and other quartermaster stores, from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots, and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipments and subsistence stores from the places of purchase and from the places of delivery under contract to such places as the circumstances of the service may require them to be sent; of ordnance, ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; freights, wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals and harness, and the purchase and repair of wagons, carts, and drays, and of ships and other vessels and boats required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several posts; hire of teamsters and other employees; extra-duty pay of enlisted men driving teams, repairing means of transportation, and employed as trainmasters and in opening roads and building wharves; transportation of funds of the Army; the expenses of sailing public transports on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; for procuring water, and introducing the same to buildings, at such posts as from their situation require it to be brought from a distance, and for the disposal of sewage and drainage, and for constructing roads and wharves; for the payment of Army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of the full amount of service be paid: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on condition that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provision only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such Government transportation as shall at that time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the balance of the appropriation of \$100,000 made by the act of May 26, 1900, for construction of military roads and bridges in Alaska remaining unexpended on June 30, 1901, is hereby reappropriated and made available for such construction: *Provided further*, That the number of draft animals purchased from this appropriation, added to those now on hand, shall be limited to such numbers as are actually required for the service.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:
The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, line 16, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "two."

Mr. HAY. The amendment which I offer makes the appropriation of this service read "twenty-two" instead of "twenty-five" millions of dollars. The committee will observe that on

page 16 of the bill the officers and crews and employees of these transports are provided for in that particular clause. Now, after careful examination into this question of the transport service, there being only 22 transports, it seems to me that \$22,000,000 is a sufficient sum to run this service. As it is run now, it is very expensive, and this appropriation ought to be cut down. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will look at page 16, he will see that the appropriation there is only for the subsistence of the crews that he speaks of. I want to say to the committee that last year it cost about \$35,000,000 for this transport service. The estimates this year were \$30,000,000, and the committee cut the estimate down \$5,000,000, appropriating \$25,000,000 for this year. The Quartermaster-General said the item should not be reduced below \$28,000,000; and we ought not to cut one penny below the amount in this bill. There is danger of having a small deficiency at the next session of Congress even with this appropriation of \$25,000,000. Now, with reference to this service being extraordinarily expensive to the Government, it has cost the Government less than one-half of what it would have cost the Government to transport these troops back and forth, if they had used the regular means of travel instead of owning their own transports.

Mr. HAY. They had to buy the transports, had they not?

Mr. HULL. The Government owns all the transports it uses.

Mr. HAY. I know they do.

Mr. HULL. But when they needed more than they owned and chartered a boat the chartered boat cost a great deal less than to use commercial lines. It seems to me that my friend is offering an amendment here which would simply either cripple the service or demand at the next session of Congress that the Committee on Appropriations shall take the matter up and report a deficiency.

Mr. HAY. Was there not a deficiency on the last appropriation?

Mr. HULL. I believe that \$25,000,000 is the least sum that we ought to appropriate at this session.

Mr. HAY. Was there not a deficiency the last appropriation?

Mr. HULL. We appropriated \$34,000,000, and in the last bill there was no deficiency.

Mr. HAY. I think the Quartermaster-General said that he had more than he needed.

Mr. HULL. If you will read the hearings you will see that he reported we ought to appropriate more than \$25,000,000.

Mr. HAY. I understand that he said he could cut it down \$2,000,000.

Mr. HULL. He said he could cut it down \$2,000,000, and the committee cut it down \$5,000,000.

Mr. HAY. But we are not transporting as many troops as heretofore.

Mr. HULL. But we are transporting all the time.

Mr. HAY. I understand we are.

Mr. HULL. We are going to transport all the time, and we have cut off \$5,000,000 by the committee below the estimates submitted to Congress, and it seems to me that \$5,000,000 is a pretty big cut, in view of what the Quartermaster-General says, and we ought not to cut it down another three millions. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe in my country's progress; I believe in advancement, and in doing all that is possible to aid in its material growth, and in making the lives of my fellow-beings happier and better.

I am not an alarmist. I believe in justice and equality, and I have faith in the common sense and loyalty of the people, and from this belief and faith I am confident that the people throughout the length and breadth of the country will sanction votes cast for general public improvements, but I am equally confident that they will be quick to condemn the unpatriotic schemes presented here, which are leading our country farther and farther away from the principles of loyal devotion and adherence to the ideas upon which this Republic was built.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem that the leaders of the Administration party have forgotten the precepts taught by our fathers; that they deliberately set out to ignore the grand heritage handed down to us by those who have gone before, that this is the "land of the noble free;" that independence and the right of the people to govern themselves are sacred principles. The air we breathe instills devotion to freedom and right, and the doctrine of the "divine right of kings" finds no lodgment in the heart of any true American.

Republican party leaders on the stump during every campaign, when appealing to the voters of the land, either are blatant-mouthed jingoists, for the occasion, or avoid the subject as a pestilence and a plague. I have not a doubt but that the great heart of the American people beats in unison with every impulse of freedom, every longing for independence that fills the heart of

every oppressed people on the globe, and if left free to carry out the noble thoughts, desires, and intentions of their nature they would join in some movement whose widening circles and swelling crest would reach to the earth's remotest bounds and extend the benedictions of liberty and peace to all of the world's oppressed.

The United States of America should stand at the head and lead in this glorious crusade of freedom as the evangel of liberty; but unfortunately her limbs have been fettered by those in power, who have sought personal ends at the expense of the country's shame.

For years in our history the Fourth of July meant something to our people. It was celebrated as a reminder of the foundation of our independence and greatness. In every hamlet and village celebrations were held, eloquent speakers portrayed the growth and glory of the country, and, in common phrase, "twisted the Lion's tail," and I have no doubt but that there are many of my Republican friends here who have been the eloquent "orator" on such an occasion and have denounced England's aggression; but such celebrations have fallen into disuse, and the stern sense of opposition to British schemes has grown less or been crowded into the background by self-interest or overcome by the glitter of British gold.

If we were true to our real convictions and should speak out our honest sentiments as American citizens, we would espouse the cause of the struggling Boers, and our voice would be heard in thunder tones demanding that the South African republics shall remain as such, and not be destroyed at the behest of the cupidity and greed of the brutal Briton.

The sturdy burghers are fighting for their very existence; and, though their numbers are comparatively small, the ferocity of British authorities has given to them a long list of heroic martyrs, whose memories are to the struggling Boers an inspiration that makes each one an host.

The Boers are fighting to maintain their existence as a separate government under a republican form. The British, under pretense of holding a suzerainty over their territory, just as the British claimed a suzerainty over the United States, are fighting to destroy the independence of the Dutch republics, and, mainly, to steal the gold and diamonds of the country.

Any intelligent and unbiased person in looking over the situation, comparing the history of the United States and England with the history of the Boers and England, would say that at the very first rifle shot fired by English ruffians at the Boers this Government would at once leap to the defense and rescue of her sister republic and say to the Imperial British Government, "Stop, we will never consent or permit such wrong. It is our mission to aid in the advance of liberty and freedom and in the building up of independent republics wherever they exist, and, 'by the Eternal,' we will do it."

Have we done this? No, no; speak it to our shame! We have not only sit by and watched the "robber nation" violate all the rules of civilized warfare in its war against the Boers, protesting neutrality, we have permitted the English to draw from our country their military supplies.

So "commercialized" is the patriotic spirit of the Administration leaders that the 150,000 horses and mules that have been purchased in this country and shipped to Cape Colony for the use of the British army are a more potent influence than all ideas of patriotism, humanity, justice, and right.

This Administration can not receive "officially" the duly authenticated representatives of the South African Republics or listen to an appeal for peace, but it can use all the power and force of the Government to guard and protect the British mules near New Orleans. I wonder that such obsequent subservency to a foreign foe, for that is what England is and ever has been to us, does not arouse the shade of old "Sam" Houston and his band of brave patriots from their graves and incite them to sweep the whole beggarly crew from America's shores.

Reason, justice, patriotism, humanity, all the memories of our past, all the hopes, aspirations, and desires of a freeborn people, prompt us to intervene in behalf of the Boers. Why do we not? Why?

It is time that we should. The horrors of war are darkening the brightness of the twentieth century dawn. The Boers are fighting for justice and the maintenance of their independence, and the spirit of independence, when once aroused, is seldom extinguished, save by the utter annihilation of every man, woman, and child of the race. Why do we not act favorably to these struggling heroes? Ah, since we have launched our destiny on the same course as imperialistic England, since we have wandered so far away from the principles upon which our Republic was founded, since we, too, as a nation are equally guilty of the same crimes against liberty, honor, and justice, for very shame's sake we can not speak a word or lift a finger in behalf of South Africa, or England would simply point to the Philippines and say, "Physician, heal thyself."

This is the answer to the question why we do not take some action to bring peace to the stricken South Africans and relieve them from the savage tortures of savage British soldiers. Let us take a survey of our surroundings, for it is high time we took our bearings and found out where we stand. We have drifted from landmark after landmark and are sailing over seas where many a ship of state has foundered.

It was the idea of the fathers that this should be a representative government, with three coordinate branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. For a century this system was on trial, as an experiment and as an assured fact, a success; but ambition and organized greed crept in, and by shrewd manipulation the executive encroached more and more upon the rights of the other branches, which tamely submitted, until now both are subordinate—in fact, if not in theory—to the executive.

Mr. Chairman, this ought not to be. No matter who occupies the Presidential chair, he is there but to execute the laws passed by Congress, and it is beneath the dignity of any legislature to follow the beck and nod of any President, irregardless of what his wishes may be. If the wishes of the people were carried out and political chicanery dropped, there might come to us such a condition that our skirts would be clean enough to permit us to speak a word for the Boers, but as long as we maintain our present condition we can not with consistency advocate any course which demands honor, patriotism, and humanity. So bound is the Government to scheming ringleaders that there is no consistency anywhere in the legislation sought to be enacted. No established rule of honor or duty is maintained. Right in Porto Rico is wrong in the States. We have one standard of dealing with Cuba, another with the Philippines, and still others, different with each subject, the only agreement being in complete deference to the trusts.

To-day war exists in our Eastern possessions—our colonies, our dependencies, our provinces—no one knows just how to describe the Philippines. But we are engaged in a brutalizing warfare there that in some ways may be compared to the conduct of the war in South Africa.

There is no question of patriotism or loyalty to the Republic involved in this war. It is simply a war of aggression and conquest. Our honor, our homes, our rights have not been assailed by any of the foes we are fighting.

They are fighting for their liberty and independence, and we are fighting for their homes and their subjection to our domination. They have made a brave, even if hopeless, struggle, but are not as yet conquered or subdued. But how great the cost to us, not alone in money but in shame and sorrow!

It is still to continue, and we will be having repetitions of the scenes described in a press dispatch from Omaha, which I will read. We have had many a ship load of confined forms brought home, and many a load like these, all part of the price paid by the nation for its crimes and for the trampling underfoot of the principles of Independence Day.

OMAHA, March 15, 1902.

A carload of maniacs brought in from the West to-day caused commotion at the Union station. The men were United States soldiers who had gone insane in the Philippines. All were absolutely mad and violent. All wore leg irons and handcuffs. Some were in strait-jackets and were bound to isolated parts of the car.

There were 18 maniacs in all. The guards and care takers were soldiers. They were stationed at the doors of the car and at intervals along it with clubbed rifles.

As the train pulled into the station there was a confused sound as of a menagerie approaching. The imprisoned men were chattering, snarling, growling, moaning, roaring, and whining like so many wild beasts. Each seemed to imagine himself some representative of the animal kingdom, and the result was terrifying and heartrending.

The maniacs are being taken to the Insane Soldiers' Hospital at Washington.

The course of the Administration can not be defended upon any moral or religious ground. It is only upon the assumption that "might makes right," and that the "almighty dollar" is in it, that the advocates of the continuance of the present policy can stand.

We hear a great deal about the large sums we are expending for the education of the natives over there, but whose money is it that we are spending? It is money that is collected there and belongs to the revenues of the islands; it is not our money; and for every teacher, preacher, Bible, or text-book we send over to those "poor heathen" we send a whole shipload of whisky and beer.

We hung on to the islands as an after conclusion. When Dewey captured the Spanish fleet and, with Aguinaldo's aid, took possession of Manila, there was no thought on the part of this Government to retain anything more than the harbor at Manila, but when the word came that the forests were valuable, that rich beds of minerals could be found, and that there were opportunities for big stealings, then the greedy cormorants of monopoly here in the States declared that they must have a show, and they have had it.

I hope they may soon get satisfied, and the only way to reach them is through the pocket. Have the Philippines paid for all the vast expenditures necessary in remaining on the islands and maintaining our present hold? Has it paid in dollars and cents,

and say nothing of the loss of honor, life, health, and reason that as a nation and as individuals we have suffered? Is the game worth the candle? In the report of the Secretary of War for 1901 the imports to the Philippine Islands for 1901 were as follows:

Great Britain	\$3,956,145
United States	2,855,685
Spain	2,161,352
Germany	2,135,252
France	1,683,929
China	4,339,941
Hongkong	2,340,585
East Indies	2,182,802
All other countries	5,623,025
Total	30,279,406

The exports were:

Great Britain	\$10,704,741
United States	2,572,021
Other countries	9,938,186
Total	23,214,948

Now, a large part of the imports were for goods for our own soldiers there, so that it was not legitimate trade of the islands. For this paltry \$2,855,685 of commerce that went from the United States, we paid out over \$100,000,000. How long will this be kept up? The independence of the Philippines is the only solution. With the people and the Democratic party rests their only hope, and not alone their hope, but the hope for the perpetuity of this Republic. The Republican party has had in its past some great leaders, men whose clear intellect, rugged honesty, and uprightness of character made them leaders, and at the inception and early days of the party these leaders enunciated the principles of the party with a vigor that was unmistakable. Compare the words of Lincoln, when he said:

These arguments that are made that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done as their condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingscraft were of this class: that they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. Turn it whatever way you will; whether it comes from the mouth of a king, an excuse for enslaving the people of the country, or from the mouth of men of one race for enslaving the men of another, it is all the same old serpent.

Or that resolution adopted by the Republicans in convention assembled in 1860:

That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, that governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.

Compare, I urge, this language, these sentiments, with that of the leaders to-day, who boldly advocate forcible annexation and declare "We have the Philippines and we are going to keep them forever." Like Pharaoh of old they have hardened their hearts, and it may be necessary for a holocaust, such as the death of all the firstborn in the land, to bring them to hear reason. It is not because there is no remedy for present conditions in the Philippine Islands that no action is taken. It is because of the opportunity given for favored officials on high salaries, for pet contractors who reap fortunes from their dealings with the Government, for syndicates and rings to get hold of valuable properties. These are the main reasons. The dollar is their god and man but a slave. As long as there is this sickening subserviency to greed there will be a demand for our brave boys to be thrown as victims to disease of body and mind, to wounds, torture, and death, in a war which has degenerated to a level with the war in South Africa, for the Philippine natives are struggling for their freedom now, as they have been for over three hundred years, and we have but taken the place of the Spaniards.

If Congress should pass resolution or the President issue proclamation that it was the intention of the United States within a year or two years, or even five years, to grant to the Filipinos an independent government, without any humiliating conditions, the native combatants would quietly seek their homes as soon as the news could reach them and at once begin the preparation for their independent statehood and take up the rebuilding of their properties, and would concede to us such naval stations and trade concessions as would in a shorter time than can ever be under our dominion of the isles reimburse us for the money we paid to Spain for their purchase. Our Republican friends, however, are having trouble all along the line. Take Cuba as another illustration. Forced by the demand of the people, we, in the name of humanity, delivered Cuba from Spanish bondage, and then, at the suggestion of the trusts, we saddled the island with a military and a carpetbag government. We saved them from murder, but left them to starve while the Rathbones and Neelys plundered the revenues.

We pledged ourselves to make it a stable government, and we so hedge it about with conditions that it is impossible for the island to develop its resources. Foreign capital was timid, as capital always is, and has kept out of Cuba while we haggled over

the political disposition of the Cuban question, and now the principal industry of the island is paralyzed by our neglect.

During our occupation of the island the sugar trust secured control of many plantations, and with changed conditions they now make their demands on Congress.

I have been opposed to a protective tariff, as such, and I would be glad to wipe out the tariff on sugar, but I also want to be equally kind to tea, to tobacco, to iron, steel, hides, and wood pulp.

I realize that the Republican leaders are in a state of mind over this Cuban question, and afraid of its outcome. They realize that there is boundless sympathy for the Cuban people in the hearts of the American people; that Cuba has untold wealth of natural resources and raw material, and if we treat them justly, and as they have the right to expect under the conditions in which we have placed them, in a very short period of time we will have an annual trade with them of hundreds of millions; but, like Demetrius of Ephesus, they cry, "Our craft is in danger," and great is their confusion.

The tariff is the fetich upheld by the trusts, and before which the Republicans bow themselves.

A Democratic standard bearer once tritely said that "the tariff is a local issue," and he was assailed and ridiculed by the opposition leaders and press for the saying, and yet each different section and locality of this country, each separate industry, has separate wants and interests to be conserved, and every tariff that has ever been made has been the result of compromises, and only satisfactory to the interests which get the most favorable consideration.

I receive from many of my Republican constituents appeals to have hides placed on the free list, because it is for the interest of leather workers to have the tariff reduced. The great newspapers of the country, Republican journals as well as others, are in distress, and beg, demand, and threaten that wood pulp must be admitted free, and so it goes all along the line.

Cuba comes and begs of us for relief, and humanity dictates that we heed her cry.

I read one of many letters I have received from Cubans:

HABANA, February 12, 1902.

HON. JAMES A. NORTON,

Member of the United States Congress, The Raleigh, Washington.

DEAR SIR: We would earnestly request you to carefully read and think over the contents of this letter, as a nation's prosperity or ruin depends on the way in which the matter herein touched on is settled.

After three years of a civil war of the most destructive character we find ourselves with all our capital invested in the reconstruction of the country, chiefly in the building up again of our two great industries, sugar and tobacco. At the commencement of the present grinding season, or, say, the harvesting of our sugar, we find ourselves with a prospective crop of fully 800,000 tons of sugar, the market price for which, duty included, in our actual market is so much below the cost to us of producing same that unless immediate measures are taken by the American Congress to give us some relief in the way of a reduction in the duties our sugar and tobacco pay on entering the United States absolute ruin stares us in the face.

This crisis in our affairs reaches every person in the island of Cuba, whether planter, banker, business man, or whatever he may be, and unless the reduction comes to us within the present month, that its benefits may reach the crop we are in these moments commencing to harvest, our conditions will be worse than ever before in this island.

It is a well-known fact that every civil war Cuba has had has been, more than anything else, due to economic reasons. The best-informed people on the island consider that the economical crisis which now overshadows us is the most serious in our history.

Unless you wish to see a people ruined and anarchy reign at the very doors of the United States, and as a direct result of her intervention for the saving of said people, we most earnestly beg and implore you to use all your well-known and powerful influence that the reduction we ask for on our sugar and tobacco may be granted us within the course of the present month; for, believe us, it is a matter of life and death for the island of Cuba, and the evils which threaten us unless this reduction is conceded we dare not think of. A failure in the present crop possibly means a complete wiping out of the existing business interests in the island of Cuba.

Respectfully, yours,

ANSELMO CASSELLS.

The fight is not so much upon giving relief, but as to the details. As sugar is the chief export from Cuba, anything that will help that industry will aid the development of the islands, and from the hearings had before the Ways and Means Committee it would seem that the removal of the differential duty, or that corresponding to color restriction, upon Cuban unrefined sugars imported into the United States would produce this result. I am in favor of this, as far as it goes. I want to help the people of Cuba to the fullest extent, not in any halfway degree; but I want the people of my own country benefited first, and I find in the evidence before the committee this statement:

Should Congress deem it advisable to make a reasonable reduction on raw sugars from Cuba, we, as beet-sugar manufacturers, can stand such a reduction on such tariff, and still, with such decreased duties, feel assured of a legitimate profit on the actual money investment.

But, while Cuba comes asking for relief, there are selfish interests here, represented by the sugar trust, which contend against this full measure of relief and join with the Administration in a policy which by making use of the necessities of Cuba will lead to forcible annexation through the medium of starvation.

Now, while it may or may not be desirable to have Cuba annexed to the Union and add another problem to our existence as

a Republic, I do not believe it wisdom or good policy or anything less than a crime to add even the "Gem of the Antilles" to the galaxy of States until it comes freely, willingly, and of the own volition of the people thereof.

We are here to legislate for the people of the United States, and in all things we should be most jealous of the interests of all the people. We should not cater or defer to one class or industry, but so act that the beneficent influence and result of our legislation will fall alike upon rich and poor, capital and labor, everywhere within our borders.

If legislation be enacted in behalf of or against sugar, then bring within the same treatment tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, lumber, iron, steel, and all the products of our country.

If the steel industry is favored, then extend the same privileges to the farmer.

If the members of a syndicate owning great steamship lines are to receive millions in the way of subsidy, then scatter millions more among the workingmen of the country. If you are going to open the vaults of the Treasury to a few, why not throw wide the doors and give all a chance to go in and steal what they choose?

You all know that this is not a land of equal opportunities, no matter how loudly, for campaign purposes only, you prate about the glorious Republic of equality. Look at the vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, not gathered by honest industry, but by favored legislation! See how they continue to be favored! Now, it is the duty of the Democratic party to be true to its principles and fight for the restoration to the people of their common heritage to be free and equal and to have equal opportunity with syndicate and trust in the benefits of legislation.

There is coming before us soon the ship-subsidy bill, which, by its provisions, is a gift, pure and simple. Under its first title the Postmaster-General can make contracts with owners of certain vessels for the carrying of the mail, and for such service the Government is bound to pay, not in proportion to the amount of mail carried, but a rate based on the gross tonnage and distance sailed by the vessels. Then, again, there is a general subsidy to freight vessels, and here the bounty is not confined to amount of freight carried, but is governed by the capacity of the vessel and the sailing distance. Again, there is a gift outright to those engaged in deep-sea fishing which has been estimated to only reach \$175,000 a year, and it would not be necessary for a single fish to be caught under the provisions of the bill. It is a most vicious bill. I read the provisions as to payment:

SEC. 5. The rate of compensation for such ocean mail service, to be paid per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed from the port of clearance in the United States to the port of entry in the United States, according to the route required by the Post-Office Department, shall not exceed the following:

Steamships of the first class, 2.7 cents.
Steamships of the second class, 2.5 cents.
Steamships of the third class, 2.3 cents.
Steamships of the fourth class, 2.1 cents.
Steamships of the fifth class, 1.9 cents.
Steamships of the sixth class, 1.7 cents.
Steamships of the seventh class, 1.5 cents.

The rates of compensation to a steamship to be employed in carrying the mails to a foreign port in North America under any contract hereafter to be made under the provisions of this act shall not exceed 70 per cent of the maximum rates established by this section: *Provided*, That in the case of failure from any cause to perform the regular voyages stipulated for in said contracts, or any of them, a pro rata deduction shall be made from the compensation on account of such omitted voyage or voyages, and that suitable fines and penalties may be imposed for delays or irregularities in the due performance of service according to the contract, to be determined by the Postmaster-General: *And provided further*, That until July 1, 1907, not more than \$5,000,000 shall be expended in any one year under the contracts provided for in this title, and after that date not more than \$8,000,000 shall be expended in any one year under the contracts provided for in this title; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such regulations for the payment of said compensation as will cause any excess in the total amount of compensation earned under this title in any one fiscal year over and above said sums respectively to be deducted pro rata from the total compensation due each person or corporation under this title during said fiscal year.

GENERAL SUBSIDY.

SEC. 6. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this title, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any vessel hereafter built and registered in the United States or now duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof), and being at the time of entry engaged in the foreign trade of the United States, which shall be entered in the United States from a foreign port or from any port in the Philippine Islands, compensation as hereinafter provided, that is to say:

(a) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, of a sail or steam vessel of over 1,000 gross registered tons, 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed.

(b) On each entry, not exceeding 16 entries in any one fiscal year, and for a period of five years from the date of registration of a vessel of over 1,000 gross registered tons, which shall be completed and registered after the passage of this act, one-fourth of 1 cent per gross registered ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed, in addition to the compensation provided in paragraph (a).

SEC. 7. That compensation under this title shall not be allowed in respect of any of the following-named vessels:

(a) A vessel on a voyage extending only to a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her last port of departure in the United States or from

a foreign port less than 150 nautical miles from her first port of arrival in the United States.

(b) A vessel on a voyage less than one-half of the whole length of which, on her outward and homeward voyages, respectively, shall have been on the sea between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

(c) A vessel which shall not be at least of the Class A1, as classified either by the Record of American and Foreign Shipping or the United States Standard Owners, Builders, and Underwriters' Association, or equivalent classification in any other register of shipping of at least equal merit.

(d) A vessel of which less than one-fourth of the crew shall be citizens of the United States or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes.

(e) A barge, canal boat, or vessel proceeding from port to port in tow, or a tugboat, or a vessel engaged in wrecking.

(f) A foreign-built vessel, hereafter admitted to American registry pursuant to the provisions of section 4136 of the Revised Statutes.

(g) A vessel while employed in the coasting trade.

(h) Steamers which during their trials have not obtained a minimum speed of 8 knots, half loaded.

SEC. 8. That the mileage upon which compensation shall be paid under this title shall be determined by the direct customary route from the last port of departure in the United States to a foreign port or a port in the Philippine Islands, and from such last-mentioned port by the direct customary route to the first port of arrival in the United States. If during the voyage the vessel shall enter at two or more foreign ports or ports in the Philippine Islands, the distance by the direct customary route between such ports shall also be included in the mileage upon which compensation shall be paid under this title.

DEEP-SEA FISHERIES.

SEC. 12. That from and after the 1st day of July, 1902, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, bounties as follows:

(a) To the owner or owners of a documented vessel of the United States engaged in the deep-sea fisheries for at least three months in any one fiscal year, \$2 per gross ton per annum: *Provided*, That at least one-third of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2174 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) To a citizen of the United States serving as a member of a necessary and proper crew of a vessel of the United States documented and engaged in deep-sea fisheries for at least three months during any one fiscal year, \$1 per month during the time necessarily employed in the voyages of such vessel.

Now, this bill is lauded to the skies by its framers as a great help to our merchant marine, and that it will promote shipbuilding in American shipyards; that in a few years all the carrying trade of the seas will be in American-built and American-owned vessels.

Let us lay aside the fact that the father of the bill is one of the large beneficiaries under the bill, and see, if we can, wherein our merchant marine will gain.

The provisions of the bill do not apply to our coasting trade, nor to commerce on the lakes and rivers of our country; only to those vessels engaged in the foreign trade. The amount to be expended is in a measure limited, and there are now more than enough vessels owned by the favored corporation to use up the entire appropriation, so what encouragement is there for the building of new ships under this law?

The shipyards of the country are not lacking in orders. Many of them are declining to accept new business by reason of the amount of business they now have on hand. It is true that a large share of our commerce with prosperous foreign countries is carried in foreign-built, foreign-owned, and foreign-manned vessels, but how that can justify or argue that we should take money out of the Government Treasury and give it to one class of people for absolutely no service rendered and compel the rest of the people to contribute to the fund by taxation is certainly a hard proposition to digest.

If the merchant marine can not maintain itself and a paternal Government must rush to its assistance, then, in all justice and fair play, apply the same principle to other industries. The farmers are not prosperous, so every time they drive to town pay them 10 cents a pound for all their whole outfit weighs over a ton for each three miles traveled. Now, would not such a proposition build up and promote agriculture?

Do you not think the farmers would then build better roads, buy larger and heavier wagons, and raise more heavy draft horses? Why, of course they would.

The laboring men are not in a flourishing financial condition. Shall we not give them a compensation of 30 cents for each tool they may have in their hands per hour? Would there not soon be an increased production of tools, a cessation of all eight-hour day agitation, and the workingmen prospering everywhere?

Where is there more right and justice in giving shipowners a subsidy than in giving the farmer and workingman?

What justice is there in paying the boat owners and the crews on boats which engage in deep-sea fishing a subsidy and ignore the fishermen on the lakes?

The whole scheme is one by which a few of the great shipowners who have already formed a trust may draw still more from the nation's Treasury.

This unjust discrimination in favor of one class of our citizens ought not to be. I believe that laws should be general in their application, and not so hedged about with restrictions as to benefit but a favored few.

It is the same way with the Chinese-exclusion law. I do not favor the exclusion of Chinese laborers alone. I do not believe that the United States should bar out the coolies of China from

the "Golden Gate" and give entrance through the "Narrows" to the paupers, the ignorant, the vicious, and criminal from the slums of every other country on the globe. I am no advocate of cheap labor. Cheap labor and contract labor are ever to be deprecated, as they are next to slavery. History, experience, and observation teach us that the best-paid labor is the most economical and produces the best results. It does more and better work. It makes better citizens. So let us broaden the restrictions of our immigration laws and shut out every element that will tend to lower our standard of citizenship.

I am in favor of home protection. Not the protection taught by Republican leaders, which would shut out the products of the "pauper labor" of Europe, but bring the pauper laborers in by the thousands to take the places of American workmen, and then shoot them down like dogs when they are starving under the meager pittance paid them and ask for more.

This leads me to speak of a breed of humans who have been brought to this country and nursed by Republican practices and Republican precepts—the anarchists.

When on that fair autumnal day in September last, like a lightning sheet from a clear sky, there flashed the news that William McKinley had been slain, a whole world paid tribute of love, sorrow, and appreciation. Here in his own country the whole nation mourned, party lines were obliterated, partisan feeling was forgotten, and under the dark cloud of our nation's disaster from every heart there welled up the most profound sympathy and grief, while all united in condemnation of the hideous crime. All parties have joined in approval of the merited punishment which was given to the spawn of hell in whose base heart that monstrous crime had its birth.

There was insistent demand everywhere that without delay Congress should legislate against "anarchy," and many good people were so exercised that the most anarchistic suggestions were made as to the form legislation should take.

Almost four months have passed since we opened this session, and the "anarchists" are still undisturbed.

The Republican party is responsible for what is done and for that which is not done here. Your acts in the past have created the conditions which breed anarchy, and you can not escape the responsibility involved in such breeding. Your high protective tariff, which engendered trusts; the importation of pauper foreign labor by the beneficiaries of your legislation, your government by injunction, the infamous "bull pen," the brutal murders at Latimer, the assassination of Goebel in Kentucky, and the protection of the instigator and hoped-for beneficiary of the murder by the Republican governor of an adjacent State, all these are the hotbeds and inspiration of anarchy. The disregard of the Constitution and subversion of equal rights and justice, the triumph of the Navy ring, and a score or more acts of autocratic misrule, all have developed anarchy.

This land of ours may suffer for a time by the sporadic growth of anarchy under the favoring shelter of Republican Administration, but it will not last. The people of this nation are always stronger than the officeholders; they are patient and enduring up to a certain point, and then they render summary justice upon the offenders, and it is to the people we must look for help, and they have never failed. Their courage and bravery has been shown on many a battlefield, their patriotism and devotion attested by a century's history, and although, while corporations control the Government and imperialism casts its dark shadow over society, a dangerous and rebellious spirit will spread throughout the land, yet the time will come when the people will demand in thunder tones that can not be ignored that class privileges must be abolished and the principles of equality and equal rights to all be established once more as the foundation wall and capstone of the temple of liberty in this nation.

[Mr. GOLDFOGLE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs a few minutes ago ought to impress the members of this House and the country at large with the fact that this Government is bound to be at an enormous expense in holding the Philippine Islands. He stated that the appropriation of two years ago for transportation to the Philippines was \$35,000,000 and that last year it was \$30,000,000.

Mr. HULL. Thirty-four millions.

Mr. PARKER. This is not for the transport service, but for transportation in general.

Mr. HULL. For transportation and supplies everywhere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand that, but most of it is for the transport service. It shows the enormous amount it is costing us to transport soldiers from one part of the country to another for embarkation and in sending them to and from the Philippine Islands. Four-fifths of this appropriation is necessitated by our occupation of the archipelago.

I want to call attention to the fact that the appropriation in

this bill for that service is \$25,000,000—an enormous amount. According to the report of the Committee on Military Affairs the amount appropriated for subsistence of the enlisted soldiers is \$11,934,000 and for the pay of the soldiers is \$12,402,000. In other words, the cost of transportation is such a large item that it exceeds the pay and the subsistence of the enlisted men.

Mr. Chairman, what I desire to call attention particularly to in this paragraph is that the cost of the Army in the Philippine Islands is enormous compared to the cost of the Army in the United States. Of the \$90,000,000 appropriated in this bill for the military establishment of the United States, I have no doubt that two-thirds of it is for the maintenance of the soldiers in the Philippine Islands. In other words, we are appropriating \$60,000,000 a year in order to hold the Philippine Islands—\$60,000,000 annually to sustain by force our sovereignty there!

Mr. Chairman, when we look at these figures we naturally inquire how are we ever going to get even on this enterprise of conquest and subjugation. If we could wipe out the past expenditures of \$300,000,000 and start anew, we could never get even on this great blunder of the American people. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of War in his annual report made a statement with respect to the commerce of the Philippine Islands which, it seems to me, ought to convince anybody that even if we have peace, even if we reduce the force to 15,000 men in the archipelago, there will still be an expenditure of more than \$20 for every dollar of profit made to our commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a table in the last annual report of the Secretary of War, which to my mind is the strongest argument from the commercial standpoint against holding the Philippine Islands that ever has been made. It shows that the total imports of the Philippine Islands for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, aggregated \$30,000,000, and of that amount the United States exported to the Philippine Islands only \$2,855,685.

It is generally asserted that the exporter of goods is doing exceedingly well if he makes 10 per cent profit on his exports. Ten per cent of that amount is only \$285,000. That, then, is the sum which the exporters from the United States make on the goods sold in the Philippine Islands in a whole year.

Mr. Chairman, we have been in possession of and the flag of our country has floated over the archipelago for nearly four years, and yet we find that we have not received 10 per cent of the total commerce of the islands. We have heard of the argument that trade follows the flag; we have heard it stated that if we planted colonies we could get their trade; and yet we have been in possession of the islands, with all the advantages in our favor, and we have captured not quite one-tenth of the commerce of the same.

Yea, more. We find that the demand for the American goods we send is made largely by our own soldiers there. If that demand were eliminated we would not have one-twentieth part of the commerce of the islands.

Mr. Chairman, the Filipinos are like other people; they buy where they can buy cheapest, and they sell where they can sell dearest. In this very table is an item that Spain, hated Spain, shipped to the Philippine Islands during the past year almost as many goods as did the United States—\$2,182,000 worth of goods—and yet they tell us that the trade follows the flag.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, we find that the Philippine people purchase from the very country they had been in rebellion against for a generation almost as many goods as they purchase from the people of the United States.

There is another statement contained in this report of the Secretary of War which every person ought to take and consider seriously in connection with the Philippine problem. It is shown by this report that although the United States commerce with the islands has increased somewhat, yet certain other nations have been increasing their commerce with the archipelago more than the United States. That statement demonstrates that trade does not follow the flag, but does follow the price list.

Now, what is that statement? The Secretary of War, on page 77 of the report, says:

The imports from the United Kingdom, from Germany, from France, and from the British East Indies have increased in greater proportion than the imports from the United States.

Think of it! With our Army there, with all the natural tendencies that our soldiers have to buy American goods, with everything

in our favor, with the flag floating from all the ports of the archipelago, yet the Secretary of War admits, in language that can have but one construction, that the imports from the United Kingdom of Great Britain, from Germany, France, and from the British East Indies have increased in greater proportion than the imports from our own country.

Mr. Chairman, is it possible that anyone can contend that "trade follows the flag," in view of that declaration of the Secretary of War? Gentlemen say that the trade will increase. It may increase; it may double, treble, or quadruple. It may increase tenfold. And yet, according to the extent of our expenditures in the past and those that are bound to be made in the future, we will expend at least \$20 out of the Treasury of the United States for every dollar of profit to our exporters of goods.

And who gets the profit? Mr. Chairman, it is not the Government. We do not get the profit. It is not even the people who get the profit. It is only one class of the people. The exporter alone gets the profit which is made upon the goods. That paltry \$285,000 is what all the exporters of the United States get in profits. But who pays the \$60,000,000 which we are appropriating in this bill? It is the people—the taxpayers. How long are the people of this country going to consent to pay \$60,000,000 a year out of their earnings for the purpose of maintaining a commerce in which there is a profit of only \$285,000 a year?

But suppose that commerce should increase a thousand per cent. That would be an extraordinary increase—not to be looked for—perhaps never to be attained; for you must remember that notwithstanding the reputation of having phenomenally increased our commerce, it took the United States more than twenty years to even double our exports. The exports of the United States for the year 1880 were \$835,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, they were \$1,487,000,000. Our exports have not quite doubled in twenty-one years. Yet it was the pride of every American that we had extended our commerce more rapidly than any other great nation of the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, assuming the exports from our country to the Philippine Islands will grow ten times faster than our commerce with the rest of the world has grown, yet for our yearly expenditure of \$60,000,000 our exporters will derive a profit of only \$2,850,000 per annum. That is, the Government will expend out of money collected from the people \$20 for every dollar of profit to our exporters of goods. If the expenditures be cut down one-half, which is not probable in this generation, yet the Government expense will be ten times the profit to commerce. What an idiotic policy, even from the commercial standpoint, it is to hold the Philippine Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to determine what is the attitude of the Democratic party in respect to our Philippine policy.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman tell us what is the attitude of the Republican party in regard to the Philippine Islands, or what policy that party has ever declared on that question?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the policy of the Republican party, as I understand it, is to do our duty there manfully and well.

Mr. COWHERD. Can not the gentleman decide what our duty is—whether we should give those people an independent government or hold them as colonies?

Mr. MONDELL. We are following our duty as we see it. We will continue to do so until the end.

Mr. COWHERD. Can not the gentleman tell us how he sees our duty?

Mr. MONDELL. I can if the gentleman will give me time.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], in a speech made here some time ago, suggested that while we could not with propriety hold the Philippine Islands, we might properly trade them off.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir; the gentleman is mistaken. I never made any such statement. I was accused of it; but it was some one else upon this side—

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman took the ground that we might bargain away or "swap" the Philippines.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no. My contention was that the only solution of the problem was to treat the Philippines in exactly the same way we promised to treat the Cubans—to promise them their independence, and then after the establishment of a stable government give it to them.

Mr. MONDELL. I certainly understood the gentleman to say we might better trade or exchange the Philippines—

Mr. SHAFROTH. No, sir; it was another gentleman on this side who said that; but the declaration never met with my approval, and when the gentleman from Iowa charged me with having made such a declaration I denied it. There is nothing in the RECORD to show that I ever said such a thing.

Mr. MONDELL. I am glad that my friend from Colorado did

not say it—that it was some other gentleman on that side who said it.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. The remark to which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] refers was made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He did not say that he wanted to trade off those islands. What he did say was that it would be better to trade them off than hold them as colonies.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we have no right to hold the Philippines I do not understand how we can have any right to swap them off to some other nation for territory elsewhere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think we have.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Missouri yesterday declared himself opposed to our Philippine policy because, he said, it was a policy of conquest. The gentleman from Colorado but a moment ago was opposed to our Philippine policy because it does not promise to bring a large return in trade. On which proposition does that side of the Chamber stand? I suppose that if there was a prospect of a large increase in commerce with the Orient by reason of our holding the Philippines, the gentleman would admit that we were justified, or would suggest that we were justified.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I would not admit. I have discussed the question from the moral standpoint. You can not get up here on the floor of the House and in five minutes cover the moral, political, military, and commercial aspect, for the simple—

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman suggested that there was no large balance of trade coming our way because of our occupancy of the Philippine Islands, and therefore we were not justified in holding the Philippine Islands. Gentlemen on the other side have a very convenient memory. They seem to have forgotten that the Philippine policy was the first fruit of our intervention in Cuba; that even before we struck the first blow at the Gordian knot of Cuban captivity we had the Philippine policy on our hands by reason of Dewey's victory in Manila Bay; that we destroyed a government, and the destruction of that government laid upon us the duty of establishing a government in its stead. Would the gentleman have us shirk our responsibilities? Would the gentleman have had us leave the islands to domestic anarchy or to spoliation on the part of foreign powers, and sail away after we had destroyed the government which we found there at the time of the battle of Manila Bay? I hope not.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the gentleman what I think we ought to have done.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman has just made his speech, and I am making mine.

Mr. SHAFROTH. You ask me the question, and if you do not care to have me answer it, very well.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, the gentleman asked what was the Republican policy in the Philippine Islands. I certainly can not speak for all of the gentlemen on this side, or for the party of which I am a member, but as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, our policy in the Philippine Islands is the policy of performing our whole duty.

I know that the opposition, with their ear to the ground to catch any faint rumblings of popular discontent with the form or result of our policy in the Orient, with their eyes bent upon the East, not to discern by the dawn's early light whether our flag in triumph still waves over fair Luzon, but to find some excuse for criticising the policy which has planted it there, which may have some weight with the voter at the coming November election, or some pretext for pulling it down, have constantly sought to disassociate two phases of the same action—our intervention to save Cuba from Spain and the firm hand we have maintained to save all of the Filipino people from some of the Filipino people; to disconnect the cause—the war with Spain—in which they glory and for which they claim a large measure of credit, from the effect—our difficulties in the Philippines, from all responsibility for which they seek to absolve themselves.

I feel that it is almost an imposition upon this House to trace the continuity of events and the rapid march of incidents—thrilling, epoch marking, inspiring—which began with the decision of the American people for intervention in behalf of Cuba, carried our flag triumphant around the world, and planted our institutions in the heart of the Orient. But to judge from some of the speeches made on the other side one would imagine that decades, if not generations, had thrown a gulf of time unbridged by continuing and connecting events between the Spanish war and the pacification of the Philippines. So convenient have been their memories they seem to have been able to forget that the Philippines were the first fruits of the Cuban intervention; that Dewey's guns aroused us to a new duty and a tremendous responsibility there before the first blow had been struck directly at the Gordian knot of Cuban captivity.

To judge from the speeches made on that side of the Chamber one would imagine that the lapse of time had entirely obliterated

from the memory of the opposition the fact that it was their acknowledged leader who drummed up votes enough in the United States Senate to ratify the treaty of Paris, and I am not surprised that the gentlemen are not anxious to recall this fact of history, challenging as it does the responsibility of their party for the inauguration of a policy which for partisan ends they now seek to criticise, and at the same time reminding them of the anything but patriotic motives which their "peerless" leader confessed actuated him in seeking to have the treaty ratified. Such is their present situation; and yet, casting a prophetic eye down the lane of time, I think I can see the day at no distant future when, forgetful of and ignoring the present attitude of the gentlemen on this floor who claim to represent the Democracy of the nation, when, denying in all probability the motives which their candidate and their leader admitted actuated him in seeking the ratification of the treaty—to embarrass a Republican Administration—they will place Mr. Bryan upon a pedestal beside the immortal Jefferson and laud him, not for his advocacy of the policies which carried Democracy to defeat in 1896 and 1900, but as the follower of Thomas Jefferson, who, like him, gave additional territory to freedom, a wider zone to American influence, and enlightenment by securing the ratification of the treaty which extended our sovereignty over the Philippines.

But, as I have said, that is the prophetic not the present view. To-day we have the spectacle of a party claiming all the credit of bringing on the war with Spain, claiming the major portion of the credit of planting the flag in Porto Rico and Santiago, while trying to pull it down in Luzon, preposterously insistent in claiming the lion's share of the credit of adopting the policy of forceful intervention, ridiculously pathetic in the turn-tale and scuttling policy advocated in dealing with the questions which intervention gave rise to, absolutely impotent and nerveless with regard to a definite policy for the future.

So far as we are concerned on this side of the Chamber, we can well afford to allow our Democratic friends to indulge to their limit the hallucinations that the American people will desert a policy strenuously pursued to a definite aim and purpose to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of nerveless vacillation and opaque uncertainty outlined by the Democratic party on this floor. We may well rest content while they seek to allay the bruises of past defeats and heal the breach of party differences with the balm of duty shirking and of issue straddling, for the people will be fooled by none of these things. Let them not vainly imagine that a discerning people will give more honor to those who, taking their own statement of the case, stood within the safe buttresses of the Congressional watch tower and sounded the charge without counting the cost, than to those who, as the fortunes of battle carried them far afield, fought to the grim finish the fight which the trumpet call brought on. Foolish are they who trust their political fortunes to the illusive hope that the American people once having put their hand to the plow will listen to the opportunists' call to turn back.

But let us assume that our friends on the other side or their party associates and leaders were in no way responsible with us for the Philippine question; that instead of advocating the policy of retreat only in the hour of accomplishment they had preached it from the onslaught; that the Republican party and its leaders were entirely responsible for the Cuban intervention and for all that has followed since. I do not believe there is any disposition on this side to shirk that responsibility, to apologize for anything that has followed. It is bootless at this late day to air our opinions as to whether or no American sovereignty could have been established in the Philippine Islands without bloodshed or with less bloodshed than has occurred. The fact remains that once the Government of Spain was destroyed there the establishment of American sovereignty was necessary to serve as a foundation of law and order upon which to build the government which is to succeed that which went down with the fall of the Spanish power. I am one of those who believe that in taking Manila we became responsible for the entire archipelago. That responsibility is not discharged except by the establishment of stable government throughout the archipelago; by the planting there, so far as we may be able to accomplish it, of the institutions which distinguish us as a people and upon which we believe must rest the permanent happiness, progress, and prosperity of any people.

Our brethren on the other side in the discussion of this question have generally started out by denying our moral right to coerce any portion of the Philippine people into a recognition of our authority, and generally end up by saying that it would be unprofitable to do so because the Philippine Islands do not offer an inviting field for American settlement or a profitable opportunity for American trade and enterprise; and it never seems to occur to them that these two arguments can not logically be advanced at the same time, for if we have been exceeding our duty and transcending our rights in the Philippines not all the fertile lands, not all the trade and commerce of the world, can justify

our action, while their arguments carried to the logical conclusion would excuse any infraction of international and moral law, providing there is enough to be gained by it.

Mr. Chairman, we have poured out our treasure like water in the Philippines. Hundreds of American soldiers have given up their lives in establishing and maintaining our flag there. There can be no justification of our policy or of the sacrifice of precious lives in either the hope or realization of enlarged trade and commerce or increased prestige in the Orient, and when our Democratic friends assail not the Republican but the national policy in the Philippines, as they have often done, by attempting to show that no great increase in trade can be expected in those regions, their arguments are a confession that from their view point the policy which they now condemn would be justifiable if it brought a large return in trade.

I thank God that our past and present policy in the Philippine Islands rests on no such indefensible foundation as desire for conquest or lust of commerce, but it rests upon the firm and substantial basis of a duty clearly seen and bravely met; that it was neither conceived nor is it being executed in the ignoble desire of territorial aggrandizement or in the vain pride of power and prestige, but in the firm conviction that our destruction of the Spanish power laid the duty upon us to plant in the soil from which we had torn the root and branch of tyranny the institutions of liberty and self-government, and in a firm and steadfast resolution to do our duty as we see it, regardless of the cost, confident that our efforts shall not be in vain; that they shall bring to us, if nothing else, at least the consciousness of a duty well performed, and that the fruits of our efforts shall be the establishment of peace, order, and justice throughout the archipelago.

The gentleman from Missouri on yesterday saw fit to compare our policy in the Philippines with that of Russia in Poland, of England in Ireland, and to draw a picture of the Filipinos as a whole which would place them on a par, at least, with the citizens of any American Commonwealth. I have no disposition to minimize the virtues of any class of the Filipino people, but in the gentleman's calmer moments I have no doubt he would be inclined to revise the fervid rhetoric with which he painted a people largely illiterate, but recently, as the evolution of races is counted, barbarous, and many of them still in that condition—a people who have had no voice whatever, in all their history, in their own government; whose only knowledge of government has been that of a monarchy, the whole history of whose colonial administration has been one of unparalleled ferocity, duplicity, and oppression, with peoples like those of Poland and Ireland, with a long and glorious national history, with aptitude for and knowledge of the arts of government; intelligent, brave, self-reliant, liberty loving.

It may suit the political purposes of some gentlemen to compare the sacrifices of their own country in the fulfillment of a duty to the tyrannies and oppressions of despotic conquerors, but I do not apprehend that that view will be shared in by any considerable number of American people.

Brief as has been our occupation of the Philippine Archipelago, we have already progressed far in the establishment of institutions which in the course of a few years will vitally effect a change of character and conditions of the Filipino people for their good. We are even now maintaining order in provinces and districts which under Spanish rule were left largely to the whims, caprices, and despotisms of petty local tyrants or to the sway of savages; we have already given the people of the more enlightened provinces a larger participation in their local government than they have ever enjoyed in all their history; we are building school-houses, sending American school-teachers, employing capable native instructors, for the purpose of educating the people to a realization of their individual responsibility and a capability for governing themselves; we have relieved them from the extortions of the Spanish taxgatherer, from the forced levy of the savage and the Ladrone; we have gone in true American spirit, steadfastly, and earnestly in the work of planting institutions which must be a lasting and inestimable benefit to the people of the Philippines.

Let no man delude himself into the belief that it is in the mind of the American people to leave the work we have begun half accomplished, to halt or vacillate in the duty which Providence has placed upon us, for the American people, as a whole, fully appreciate their responsibility in this regard, though some few among us do not.

As a people we were charged first with the responsibility and granted the high privilege of developing and peopleing a virgin continent, rich beyond all comparison in natural resources. Thanks to these bountiful gifts and to the energy and courage of our people, we have grown and developed to a commanding position among the nations of the earth. Can it be possible that there are any so unmindful of the duties which power, prestige, and commanding position lay upon nations as to imagine that we owe no duty to civilization and have no responsibilities beyond our

borders; who imagine that we can, without loss of our own self-respect and degradation in the eyes of all the world, in the wantonness of our strength leave a people who our act has deprived of the only government they have ever known to the chance of domestic anarchy or foreign spoliation and exploitation?

Our policy in the Philippines is a policy of duty. Our presence there is demanded by every consideration of national honor and responsibility, and we shall remain there to the glory of our principles and to the infinite benefit of the people of the islands. As to the final outcome I have no fear. The task has not and will not be an easy one. No great and beneficent work ever has been accomplished without infinite cost and effort, but I have faith in the people of the Philippine Islands. I have faith in the efficacy of the principles of the Republic even when transplanted to the Orient, and I look forward with confidence to the no distant future when our work and our efforts there shall be applauded by the Filipino people themselves, when it shall be said, to the everlasting glory and honor of the Republic, that not only have we established and maintained the principles of liberty and justice on this continent, but have carried them undiluted, undefiled, into the heart of the Orient, where in the days to come the Philippine Archipelago, with her millions of law-abiding, enlightened, and prosperous citizens, shall be an everlasting example of the fidelity of the Republic to its duty and of the strengthened efficacy of the American ideals.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming propounded a question which he then proceeded to answer himself, but I notice that he took particular pains to evade the question I propounded to him. Whenever discussion of the Philippine Islands has come up on this floor, some gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber have arisen and said, "Oh, you voted for war, and therefore we must proceed to hold the Philippines indefinitely as colonies or as subjects." I deny that any gentleman can find any logical connection between holding the Philippine Islands and voting that Spain should cease to oppress the Cubans in this hemisphere. I deny there is any connection between stopping oppression by Spain in Cuba and beginning oppression by the United States in the Philippine Islands, but I want to challenge the statement of the gentleman as to what was the Republican policy. I have made some attempt to find it in the records, I have searched through the messages of the President and through the reports from the War Department, and I assert here that no man can tell authoritatively what the Republican policy is in the Philippine Islands.

Gentlemen will remember that a few years ago, when we first asserted from this side of the Chamber that it was the intention to hold the Philippine Islands, distinguished gentlemen rose on the other side of the Chamber and denied it indignantly—aye, they even challenged us then to point to a single sentence from the Republican President, to a single line in the Republican platform, to an authoritative statement from a Republican leader that they ever intended to hold the Philippine Islands, but that they were simply attempting to settle conditions in the Philippine Islands. That was the statement then. A year or two later came the statement that they were simply attempting to establish a government so as not to leave a condition of anarchy upon our withdrawal. What is the proposition now? Oh, that they are going to do their duty. What is that duty? Why do you not define it?

I defy any man to point to an authoritative statement as to what is to-day the Republican policy in the Philippine Islands and what they intend eventually to do. Whether they intend to hold those islands forever as colonies, whether they intend to give those islands self-government, whether they intend to make them States, the Republican party has never declared, and they dare not declare it. They dare not say they intend to hold them forever as colonies; they know the people of the United States in large measure will disapprove of it. They dare not say they intend to make them States and make the 10,000,000 Filipinos the equals of the American people, with equal privilege of voting for American Presidents; and notwithstanding this condition in his own party, the gentleman has the sublime nerve, if he will permit me to say it in kindness, to rise here and talk humorously as to what is the Democratic position. We have declared our position in our platform. You have not any position, and you have never had the courage to announce one on the floor of this House or elsewhere. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 22, 1902:

H. R. 11471. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

H. R. 11474. An act for the acknowledgment of deeds and other instruments in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico affecting land situate in the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States; and

H. R. 9991. An act for the relief of F. E. Coyne.

On March 24, 1902:

H. R. 3148. An act for a marine hospital at Buffalo, N. Y.

On March 26, 1902:

H. R. 4607. An act to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.

On March 27, 1902:

H. R. 3297. An act to correct the military record of William T. Pratt.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Manufacture, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, \$1,700,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of the appropriations made for the Ordnance Department shall be used in payment of freight charges on ordnance or ordnance stores issued by said department.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 33, in line 13, strike out the word "seven" and insert "one;" so that it will read "\$1,100,000" instead of "\$1,700,000."

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, \$1,100,000 was the amount estimated by the War Department and was the estimate sent to us.

The majority of the Committee on Military Affairs thought proper to increase this item from \$1,100,000 to \$1,700,000 upon the ground, as I understand it, that the National Guard would need a larger supply of firearms and upon the further ground that this country might get into a foreign war, when it would need more guns.

Now, on page 88 of the hearings, the chairman of the committee, in referring to this item, said:

The next item is a very important one; it is this item of \$1,100,000. How much of a reserve of these modern guns will that provide?

General CROZIER. 65,000 or 70,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The militia of the different States are now clamoring for a law that will give them the new guns and take up the old guns. Can you do that?

General CROZIER. If a law were passed in that form we would have to increase the appropriation to make good the amount given the militia.

The CHAIRMAN. That question of supplying the militia would naturally come before the Committee on the Militia, but the manufacturing of guns comes before us.

General CROZIER. If that law should pass we would have to ask for an additional amount to replace those guns in this appropriation.

Mr. PARKER. Have you the machinery to increase your products?

General CROZIER. Yes; we can increase the product.

Mr. PARKER. How many can you make with your machinery when pressed?

General CROZIER. We can perhaps make 90,000 in a year, but we can always nearly double the output by running two shifts—employing two shifts of men and working sixteen hours instead of eight.

Mr. PARKER. Have you the men to run the machinery sixteen hours?

General CROZIER. Yes, sir; during the war we got out 350 a day—that is, working sixteen hours.

Now, there is no necessity for that increase. There is no possibility or probability of any foreign war at this time, and if there should be, an appropriation could be made.

There is no necessity for this from the standpoint of the National Guard, because under the appropriation asked for they can turn out 70,000 rifles a year, and there are not in the country over 100,000 of these national guards.

Therefore I say, in the interest of economy—and the gentleman says he wants to economize—let us cut out this appropriation, which the War Department does not ask for, and which the general of the Ordnance Bureau does not press in these hearings.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at this motion. If the gentleman will examine the testimony of General Crozier he will find that in his oral statement, as well as in the letter which he sent to me on that subject, General Crozier expressed his opinion that this appropriation was necessary in order speedily to obtain a reserve for the use of the United States Army of 300,000 rifles. Does any gentleman in this Chamber forget—

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PARKER. Excuse me; I have only a few minutes. I will yield to the gentleman at the end of what I have to say.

Does anyone in this Chamber forget that at the outbreak of the Spanish war, when we called out 250,000 volunteers, we had no weapons with which to arm them except obsolete Springfield rifles? The Regular Army, then consisting of 25,000 men, were the only troops for whom it was possible to afford new magazine rifles, so that they should meet soldiers armed with Mausers on an equal footing.

Do we forget that under those circumstances every man felt as if it were murder to send our men into the field armed only with Springfield rifles? Do we forget how we were then asking why,

as a protection against war, as a prevention of the danger of war, we did not have in our arsenals a reserve of rifles sufficient to put in the hands of our patriotic soldiers, so that we should not fear attack by any foreign country?

That was in 1898. With improved facilities we are now making 65,000 rifles a year with \$1,100,000 appropriations. Last year the appropriation was smaller and we made less. Make the most liberal estimate for what rifles we have made since the war, and then remember that 50,000 of those went into the hands of the regular troops that have been added to our original 25,000 men to make the 75,000 men that we have now in service.

At least 50,000 rifles may be estimated to have been used up, lost, or destroyed in the requirements of the service. I do not state to this House, because it is a matter of confidence always, what the reserves stores of the Government are ready for the use of a citizen soldiery. But any man, reckoning from the number that we make, can say that in the armories of the United States, outside of arms in the hands of the regular troops, we have not enough rifles to arm the 250,000 troops which we called out in the war with Spain.

Any man can reckon this, and has a right to take that from the figures, knowing what we make and what we have used. Now, a country of such size that at one time it had 2,000,000 men in the field has no right to remain without sufficient small arms to be able to provide them to its armies on the instant. The gentleman's statement that we can make what we need on a sudden call is negated by what took place in the Spanish-American war. Now, the militia, amounting to 100,000 men, also ask for new guns. Shall we tell them they will have to wait two years until they can be manufactured?

It is true that we appropriate by the present law to the militia a million dollars a year, and give them the money to pay for rifles, but they want the guns, and they do not want to wait till we make them. We should have the rifles ready to deliver and still keep a reserve for volunteers. I am surprised the gentlemen from the Committee on Military Affairs should make such a proposition. Skimp your fortifications if you will; skimp your artillery if you will—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I ask that the gentleman from New Jersey may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New Jersey be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARKER. Skimp your Navy even, if you will. The protection of the country rests finally in a free people with arms in their hands; and the war in South Africa, to which appeal is so often made, proves the fact that the one defense of a free people consists not in staffs or in uniforms, or in forts or intrenchments, and not even in wealth; but the protection of a free people consists in men whose rulers have had the foresight, the wisdom, and the patriotism to insist upon laying up in arsenals small arms, the best the world knows, and ample ammunition with which to use them. It is in this view that I have asked for the additional appropriation, enough to make 50,000 more rifles a year for the present, until we have such a reserve. I wish I had asked for double that amount, for our factories could turn out 100,000 more in a year if we would pay for them.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PARKER. I request the gentleman to wait until I am through. The cost of a soldier in the Regular Army is \$1,000 a year. The cost of a gun is about \$12; and we know it will not go out of fashion for at least five years. The Springfield stayed in use for thirty years. This is the cheapest, it is the best, it is the most necessary military appropriation ever asked of Congress, and we should make it; and if we do not do so, then the people will know the reason why. Now I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HAY. I will take it in my own time.

Mr. HULL. Just one minute.

Mr. HAY. I would like to reply to some of the astonishing remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman will have an opportunity before debate closes. He should close the debate on this amendment.

I want to call the attention of the House to the reason why this committee increased the amount over the estimate submitted by the War Department. The gentleman from Virginia read a part of the hearings. On page 88 of the hearings, General Crozier, in answer to my question, said:

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is a very important one; it is this item of \$1,100,000. How much of a reserve of these modern guns will that provide?

General CROZIER. Sixty-five thousand or 70,000 a year.

I then said:

The militia of the different States are now clamoring for a law that will give them the new guns and take up the old guns. Can you do that on this appropriation?

And General Crozier answered:

If a law were passed in that form we would have to increase the appropriation to make good the amount given the militia.

Now, on page 90 he returns to this question. Mr. ESCH of Wisconsin, a member of the committee, asked him this question:

And in addition to that there are appropriations made by the several States?

General Crozier answered:

Yes, sir; some of the States are quite liberal, and when material is used by the General Government, as was done during the Spanish-American war, the States are reimbursed, as is proper.

Then Mr. BRICK asked him this question:

Mr. BRICK. If this \$1,000,000 appropriation is made for the militia of the United States, will there be enough money to equip each man?

And General Crozier answered:

General CROZIER. They get now \$900,000 more than before. It will take between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000 to equip all the organizations with the magazine rifle, and that would do it in three years.

Now, to ask the War Department to give a supplemental estimate would have brought no information, because the War Department have no information as to what was proposed by Congress; but after the estimates were submitted to Congress the Committee on the Militia have reported a bill asking that we give these new arms to the militia. When the National Guard Organization met in Washington a few weeks ago they were unanimous in asking that we make this exchange of guns. In this proposed militia bill it is proposed to exchange new guns for the old. So the expense of manufacture must be carried on this bill. The old gun has already been charged up against their appropriation, and if we are to supply them with these guns, it is necessary that this Congress appropriate \$600,000 more in order to make that exchange. And in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the militia ought to be encouraged in every way that it is possible for the Federal Government to encourage such organizations by giving them the best gun we can make, because every one of us recognizes it is upon the militia the country must depend in every great war, and for that reason I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] should be so very much surprised at the amendment I offered, because I voted against the appropriation when it came before the Committee on Military Affairs, and he was present and heard it. I appreciate very much the enthusiasm of the gentleman from New Jersey, which seems to be infused into him because of the proposition to cut down this item, which has not been asked for by the War Department. The gentleman says that these guns will not go out of fashion for five years.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a most excellent reason why we should not make a large number of these guns, if they are going out of fashion in five years. Then we should have to go to work and make new guns. The War Department must have known what it was doing when it asked for an appropriation of \$1,100,000 to make a reserve supply of these guns. Why should we now, when we have got an Army fully armed with these guns, and when we can turn out this year 70,000 of them and are turning out every day guns of that character, why should we have this large appropriation when we should have made enough this year and next year to supply the National Guard?

Mr. HULL. Does not General Crozier state that it will take three years to arm the National Guard?

Mr. HAY. General Crozier says it would take three years to arm them under the appropriation, but he also stated that there was only 100,000 of the National Guards now, and therefore his statement must have been a mistake, because our own soldiers are armed with these guns, and if there were only 100,000 of the National Guard, and we can make 70,000 a year, it seems that he must be mistaken.

Mr. HULL. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it requires a good many guns to make up for the casualties that occur from time to time.

Mr. HAY. How many?

Mr. HULL. I can not say, but I think quite a large per cent. I think General Crozier's statement is probably true in regard to the length of time it will take to arm the militia. He should know.

Mr. HAY. I can not see exactly the force of the gentleman's remark, and I was unable to catch the percentage that he stated.

Mr. HULL. I did not give it because I have not got it, but it does take quite a per cent.

Mr. HAY. Is there any great necessity for giving the National Guard these arms now?

Mr. HULL. I should say, yes; on the general theory that if you have an organized National Guard you ought to give them the best possible arms.

Mr. HAY. I agree to that; but is it necessary to spend the money now, if you propose to do it?

Mr. HULL. It would not be necessary to continue to expend it after the next fiscal year.

Mr. HAY. I understand it is proposed to continue the appropriation to provide for a foreign war. That was the contention of the gentleman from New Jersey. I hope the House will adopt the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was considered and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase of ordnance and ordnance stores and supplies may be made by the Ordnance Department in open market, in the manner common among business men, when the aggregate of the amount required does not exceed \$200, but every such purpose shall be immediately reported to the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there is an error in line 22, and I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, page 33, strike out the word "purpose," and insert the word "purchase."

The amendment was agreed to.

This completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on the bill may have leave to print.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that the Committee of the Whole does not give general leave to print. The motion of the gentleman will be in order in the House, but not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HAY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the request for unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask a similar privilege on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEMENWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12804) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, they will be submitted in gross.

The amendments were considered, and agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENCE OF CUBA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the Congress timely consideration of measures for maintaining diplomatic and consular representatives in Cuba and for carrying out the provisions of the act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, approved March 2, 1901, reading as follows:

"Provided further, That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled 'For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect,' the President is hereby authorized to 'leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people' so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba substantially as follows:

"I.

"That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain, by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

"II.

"That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

"III.

"That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life and property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

"IV.

"That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

"V.

"That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

"VI.

"That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

"VII.

"That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

"VIII.

"That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States."

The people of Cuba having framed a constitution embracing the foregoing requirements, and having elected a president who is soon to take office, the time is near for the fulfillment of the pledge of the United States to leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people. I am advised by the Secretary of War that it is now expected that the installation of the government of Cuba and the termination of the military occupation of that island by the United States will take place on the 20th of May next.

It is necessary and appropriate that the establishment of international relations with the government of Cuba should coincide with its inauguration, as well to provide a channel for the conduct of diplomatic relations with the new State as to open the path for the immediate negotiation of conventional agreements to carry out the provisions of the act above quoted. It is also advisable that consular representation be established without delay at the principal Cuban ports in order that commerce with the island may be conducted with due regard to the formalities prescribed by the revenue and navigation statutes of the United States, and that American citizens in Cuba may have the customary local resorts open to them for their business needs and the ease arising, for the protection of their rights.

I therefore recommend that provision be forthwith made, and the salaries appropriated, to be immediately available, for—

a. Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Republic of Cuba	\$10,000
b. Secretary of legation	2,000
c. Second secretary of legation	1,500
d. Consul-general at Habana	5,000
e. Consuls at—	
Cienfuegos	3,000
Santiago de Cuba	3,000

I do not recommend the present restoration of the consulates formerly maintained at Baracoa, Cardenas, Matanzas, Nuevitas, Sagua la Grande, and San Juan de los Remedios. The commercial interests at those ports heretofore have not been large. The consular fees collected there during the fiscal year 1896-97 aggregated \$752.10. It is believed that the actual needs of the six offices named can be efficiently subserved by agents under the three principal consular offices until events may show the necessity of erecting a full consulate at any point.

The commercial and political conditions in the island of Cuba while under the Spanish Crown afford little basis for estimating the local development of intercourse with this country under the influence of the new relations which have been created by the achievement of Cuban independence, and which are to be broadened and strengthened in every proper way by conventional pacts with the Cubans and by wise and beneficent legislation aiming to stimulate the commerce between the two countries, if the great task we accepted in 1898 is to be fittingly accomplished.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 27, 1902.

EFFICIENCY OF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Mr. DALZELL. I submit a report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules having had under consideration House resolution 151, submits the following substitute:

"Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this rule the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider Senate bill numbered 1025, 'An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service;' that said bill shall be considered as a special order until finally disposed of, but shall not interfere with appropriation or revenue measures, conference reports, or other measures of privilege or special orders heretofore made."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary that I should occupy any time in discussing this proposed rule. Its purpose, which is very plain, is to make immediately in order the consideration of the Senate bill for the promotion of the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and to permit that bill to hold its place until finally disposed of, not to interfere, however, with privileged matters.

Mr. HULL. If the rule should be adopted without any further qualification, would it not cut off pension business to-morrow?

Mr. DALZELL. No; there is a reservation of previous orders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire only a few minutes myself, but I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], a member of the committee that reported the bill, would like to be heard against the adoption of this proposed rule.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois desire?

Mr. MANN. I should like to have half an hour if I can get it.

Mr. DALZELL. Make it fifteen minutes.

Mr. MANN. What I have to say will be upon the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Does my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] want to occupy any time himself?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to occupy about five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be reminded when I have occupied five minutes, because I want to yield the rest of the twenty minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule, because it brings before this House a bill which I think is the opening wedge to a class of legislation that it would be very dangerous for our Government to enter upon. I have nothing to say against the original bill as drafted, nor have I anything to say against the gentlemen concerned in pressing the bill. The officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are men of high character and standing, but in the end they are simply civil employees of the Government. You can not make any more out of them than that. They have taken part in several of our wars, and have conducted themselves gallantly. But they are not a part of the military or naval department of this Government. Their business is that of revenue agents at sea, just as the deputy marshal or internal-revenue collector is a revenue agent on land. They are controlled by the Secretary of the Treasury. He orders them to come and go. They are not under ordinary circumstances expected to do the work of a naval or military officer.

It is true that in time of war their vessels, and sometimes their personal services, are used for war purposes. But they do not have to go to war. They can resign if they do not care to carry their vessel into naval conflict.

There are thousands of other good citizens in this country who go to war when war comes on. They go as volunteers. Is that any reason why we should establish a retired list for all the volunteer officers who served in the civil war or who served in our Spanish war? Not at all. Military duty is not their life employment; it is only an incident in their lives. But with the regular Navy or Army officer his line of duty is the business of his lifetime, and we provide for him a salary accordingly, and then a place on the retired list with pay when he has no longer work to do.

But these gentlemen in the Revenue-Cutter Service, as I have already stated, are merely the revenue agents of the Government to prevent smuggling, to see that the tariff taxes are paid, that the tariff laws are carried out. They receive their orders from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we once start upon a precedent that authorizes the retirement of civil employees of the Government upon a pension where are we going to stop? Last year there were upon the Calendar several bills, and there have been introduced this session, if they have not already been reported, several bills, for retiring upon a civil pension men engaged in the Weather Bureau Service, in the coast-guard service, in various departments of this Government—all these bills providing for a retirement pay or a civil pension list.

I grant you (for I believe it is the fact) that of all these bills the revenue-cutter bill is the most meritorious. But whenever you break down the line and start in this direction, where are you going to stop? Each branch of the Government service will say it has meritorious men who have given their lives for the good of the Government and who ought to be taken care of in their old age. Mr. Speaker, do we not give our lives to the Government? Would not a great many of us be willing to serve our constituents for a great many years to come and yet ask no retirement pay?

All through the civil service of the Government we have men who have given their lives to the service, but we are supposed to pay them salaries from which they can lay aside something, as they ought to do, for the day and the hour when they must retire from active service.

Now, that is the reason I am opposed to the general bill. The reason I am opposed to the adoption of the rule is this: We have a number of bills on the Calendar that are seeking the consideration of this House, meritorious bills, bills where they have an absolutely unanimous report from the committees from which they come. I say that that class of bills should have the right of way. This rule is brought in here to give this bill the right of way.

Now, here comes a bill before this House, true, reported by a majority of a committee, but with a minority report, and that minority report not along partisan lines. If it was—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one word, and then I will yield the balance of my time. If it was reported only by a majority of this House and the minority of this House was opposed to it it might be said that party exigencies required it to be taken up, but in the minority report members on that side of the House have reported against its consideration as well as members on this side of the House, and under these circumstances I say this is not the hour or the time when this House should engage upon the consideration of this bill. I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to address myself particularly in opposition to the bill itself at this time, but I hope I may give a few reasons which may appeal to the members of the House why this bill should not be considered at this time. There are pending before Congress various bills of like character in regard to other branches of the Government. The bill which the rule proposes to make the continuous order is a bill called "A bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service." The title is misleading. It is a bill designed wholly for the purpose of increasing the salaries of revenue-cutter officers and of creating a retired list for those officers. There are many other branches of the Government which desire the same thing. The Railway Mail Service, the Life-Saving Service, the Light-House Service, and various other bureaus or branches of the Government service which are dangerous in character are requesting Congress that something shall be done in reference to a retired list.

What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is not sufficient information obtainable in reference to the Revenue-Cutter Service by which we can learn whether this Service should be picked out from all the other branches of the civil department of the Government for preferment.

And I call the attention of the members of the House to this peculiar situation of affairs: The Revenue-Cutter Service is the one branch of the Government employ which makes no report of its doings or its expenditures. The Life-Saving Service makes an annual report, which is published; the Marine-Hospital Service makes an annual report, which is published; so does the Light-House Service, so does the steamboat inspector, so does the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and so do all the other branches of the Treasury Department. The one exception, the one branch of the Government service in the Treasury which makes no report at all, is the Revenue-Cutter Service.

There has been no annual report from that Service for four years, no report from this branch of the Government since 1897, although this is the one which is now seeking preference at our hands over all other branches of the service. Nor is this all. In 1888 Congress provided—and I ask the attention of the members of the House:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress at its next session a detailed statement of expenditures for the fiscal year 1888 under the appropriation for the Revenue-Cutter Service; and annually thereafter a detailed statement of expenditures under said appropriation shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Here is a specific statute requiring this Revenue-Cutter Service to submit to Congress a detailed statement of its expenditures. If any gentleman on the floor of this House can find a detailed statement by this service of its expenditures I will withdraw any opposition which I have to the passage of the bill. This service has spurned the law of the United States. It pays no attention to the statutes of the Government. It makes no annual report of its doings. It refuses to comply with the statute which says that it shall make a detailed report of expenditures—

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. HEPBURN. What officer did the gentleman say was required to make this report?

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury in all of these cases means the officer in command of the particular branch of the service. It may have been the fault of the Secretary of the Treasury that he did not require this law to be complied with. That is not what I am calling to the attention of the House. I say that before the House considers this proposition it is entitled to have the report which the law says the service shall make. And whether it be the fault of the Secretary of the Treasury or of the Revenue-Cutter Service makes no difference.

Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to investigate the subject of this bill as best I could for a year and a half. I have not been able to acquire the information which ought to be laid before the House, because this branch of the Government service makes no

report. The only report of the expenditures of the Revenue-Cutter Service, in any way, shape, or manner, made to Congress is included in the "combined statement of receipts and expenditures" of the Government, wherein, under the head of the "Customs service" expenditures is a one-line item, "Expenses of Revenue-Cutter Service, \$1,246,550.61."

This is the only detailed statement made to Congress.

Before we pass upon the question of considering this bill we ought to be permitted to examine the detailed statement which the law requires them to make and which they do not make.

Nor is this all. The statute of 1889 provides that this service shall make a report in detail, showing separately the amount required for pay of officers, rations, etc., and that there shall be included—

in the Annual Book of Estimates a statement showing the authorized number of officers and cadets in the Revenue-Cutter Service, their rank and pay; also the number of men constituting the crews of vessels in said service.

They make a pretense of complying with this section of the statute, but they do not really comply with its requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the only report of the Revenue-Cutter Service for last year, published anywhere, is included in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and covers less than one-third of a page, so far as the annual operations of the department are concerned; and the statement in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, furnished by the Revenue-Cutter Service itself to the Secretary of the Treasury, is not true. The Secretary of the Treasury reports:

The following is a summary of the work performed by vessels of the Revenue-Cutter Service during the year.

And here are half a dozen or more items, one of which is the following:

Lives saved (actually rescued) from drowning, 178.

I do not call attention to this for the purpose of opposing the bill at this time, but for the purpose of trying to show to the House that we have not sufficient information upon which to base intelligent action. The statement in this report of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Revenue-Cutter Service "actually rescued from drowning," in the language of the report, 178 lives last year is not true.

In order to make up the report of 178 lives saved last year, "actually rescued from drowning," they included 103 lives, as I find by examination of the books in the Department itself, which they credit to the revenue cutter *Gresham* as saving from the barkentine *Fraternidade* on August 13, 1900; and I have here a copy of the report of the captain of the revenue cutter *Gresham* at that time, stating that he saved no lives at all. If we had had a printed report of the operations of this Service it would have shown that they saved no lives at that time; but in order to make out that they are doing great work, they furnished to the Secretary of the Treasury a statement that they saved 178 lives, including in the number these 103 lives which were not saved, which the captain said were not saved from drowning, on August 13, 1900.

Nearly all of the report is equally misleading. The Revenue-Cutter Service has not made a report for four years, because it has been seeking this legislation during that time, and it has not dared to publish to Congress what its duties are or what it is doing.

If the report of the Revenue-Cutter Service were published it would show that no boat in the control of the Revenue-Cutter Service had its anchor weighed so much as eight days per month. If this report were published it would show that the average service of the revenue cutters during the last year is equal to about four days per month per vessel. I dare the Revenue-Cutter Service to publish its reports; and I say, Mr. Speaker, that until the branch of the Government which is required to make reports, complies with the law and makes the reports, it is not proper for us to take up the time of the House in order to increase the salaries of that service and give it a retired list ahead of any other branch of the Government.

Every part of the civil Government wants a retired list. Every branch of the Government wants its superannuated clerks cared for. Why should we prefer a service because it is unknown and makes great claims?

Let the Revenue-Cutter Service publish their reports, and if the reports show that they do what they claim, perhaps they may be entitled to it. I deny that they are entitled to the preference. I deny that they do the work which they claim that they do, though I do not wish to reflect upon the captain who is at the head of that service, and who is a courteous gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I take it that this rule is presented to the House at this time, because last year through the persistence of some revenue-cutter officers there was obtained a petition signed by a majority of the House asking that a rule then be reported. In conformity with that petition a rule—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Can I get about two more minutes?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MANN. In accordance with that petition, Mr. Speaker, a rule was brought in from the Committee on Rules at that time, and the bill was made a continuing order. I suppose now that this rule is reported simply because the bill was never finished in the last House. I do not believe that the leaders on this side of the House are in favor of the passage of this bill or that they are in favor of the passage of this rule to force the consideration of the bill without an opportunity to understand it by reports from the Department itself.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary that I should say anything, I hope, in favor of the consideration of this rule, after the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Illinois. If a speech could show the necessity of the consideration of a question, the statements that have been made by that gentleman appear to me would serve all proper purposes. The gentleman has charged that one of the chief officers of this Government, who has been charged by a statute with the performance of a specific duty, for four years—he states so—has contumaciously refused to perform that duty. Is it not wise that after this charge has been made, after this negligence has been specifically pointed out, after a base motive has been given for this neglect of duty, that there should be some investigation by the peoples' representatives?

He has charged that officer of this Government, whose duty it is to make reports of facts, to state truths, that year after year he has lied in the discharge of his official duty. Is it not time there should be some inquiry with regard to a matter of that kind, and that the gentleman should be given an opportunity to make proof of reckless and irresponsible charges of this character? I think that the House must have been satisfied when the gentleman took his seat that at least he should have an opportunity in a proper and a legitimate way to make good some small modicum at least of these grave charges. I yield back the time to the gentleman.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to this order just a moment. As I understand it, it is a continuing order, not to conflict with orders heretofore made, not to conflict with revenue or appropriation bills. The gentleman will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. DALZELL. What was it the gentleman said?

Mr. CANNON. I say, as I understand it, it is a continuing order covering this bill, not, however, to conflict with orders heretofore made, or with revenue or appropriation bills.

Mr. DALZELL. Or with conference reports.

Mr. CANNON. But, with that exception, like a jack-in-the-box, from this time until the end of this session, and the next, too, the moment that those privileged matters are out of the way it pops up like a jack-in-the-box, and all other matters on the Calendar are subordinated until this is finished. It becomes a matter of the highest privilege. It is not often that an order of this kind is made, and I doubt the wisdom of making it. Now, then, as to the merit of the proposed legislation, I shall not discuss it. That is a matter that gentlemen differ about, and I have no doubt honestly differ about. If I were to discuss it, I should say that we are coming to the parting of the ways in the matter of enlarging the retired list for those in the service of the Government. It now covers the Army, and it now covers the Navy. This service wants to go on.

The Light-House Service and the Life-Saving Service also want to go on; and the last two named services have, perhaps, more merit than this; and then there are various other branches of the civil service that want to go on the retired list. I do not believe that the House ought to adopt this order, making it a continuing order, as it does, to the exclusion of all other business, until the end of this Congress; and therefore I shall vote against the order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does it interfere with the Pension Calendar and the Claims Calendar?

Mr. CANNON. I take it, not.

Mr. DALZELL. It does not.

Mr. CANNON. Those are special orders, heretofore made.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no opinion to express at this time upon the merits of the bill. But I think that the gentleman from Illinois is anticipating a condition of things that can not possibly exist. With respect to the form of the rule, it is a form which has been used a great many times. In fact, it is the usual form, making it in order to discuss a question until it shall have been disposed of, saving the rights of matters of higher privilege.

The gentleman says it may pop up at any time, as it did during the last session of Congress. Now, the reason why it was a nuisance to the House in the last Congress was because the rule was brought in during the last days of the session, I think within a week or ten days before the end of the session, at a time when, as gentlemen know, the House is engaged almost every day in the consideration of conference reports and matters of that kind. It is not possible, in my judgment, that any such condition of things can exist during this period of the session, and I think, therefore, the fears of my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] are not well founded. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the substitute resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 84, noes 54.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen on this side do not understand what they are to vote upon. I ask that the substitute resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolution asking for the consideration of the act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is a substitute resolution.

The SPEAKER. It is a substitute for the original resolution, so that one vote will adopt the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 118, nays 67, answered "present" 16, not voting 154; as follows:

YEAS—118.

Adams,	Dayton,	Kahn,	Robinson, Ind.
Allen, Me.	Dick,	Knapp,	Rumple,
Aplin,	Dovener,	Lamb,	Ryan,
Ball, Del.	Draper,	Latimer,	Salmon,
Bates,	Driscoll,	Lester,	Shallenberger,
Bell,	Emerson,	Lindsay,	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Esch,	Littauer,	Small,
Bingham,	Evans,	Littlefield,	Smith, S. W.
Bishop,	Fitzgerald,	Long,	Southard,
Blakeney,	Gaines, W. Va.	McDermott,	Southwick,
Brick,	Gardner, N. J.	McLachlan,	Sperry,
Bristow,	Gibson,	Mahon,	Steele,
Brownlow,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marshall,	Stevens, Minn.
Burk, Pa.	Goldfogle,	Martin,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gordon,	Meyer, La.	Sulloway,
Butler, Pa.	Graff,	Miers, Ind.	Sulzer,
Calderhead,	Graham,	Minor,	Tawney,
Capron,	Grosvenor,	Moody, N. C.	Taylor, Ohio
Cassel,	Grow,	Moody, Oreg.	Thomas, Iowa
Conner,	Hamilton,	Morris,	Tongue,
Coombs,	Hemenway,	Nevin,	Wachter,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Cousins,	Hill,	Otjen,	Warner,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Parker,	Warnock,
Crumpacker,	Hooker,	Payne,	Watson,
Curtis,	Howell,	Pearre, Md.	Weeks,
Cushman,	Hughes,	Perkins,	Woods,
Dalzell,	Jack,	Powers, Me.	Wright,
Darragh,	Jenkins,	Prince,	
Davis, Fla.	Jones, Wash.	Ray,	

NAYS—67.

Allen, Ky.	Henry, Conn.	Mickey,	Selby,
Bowie,	Henry, Miss.	Miller,	Shafroth,
Burgess,	Howard,	Mondell,	Smith, Ky.
Burkett,	Jackson, Kans.	Moody, Mass.	Sparkman,
Burnett,	Jett,	Moon,	Spight,
Caldwell,	Jones, Va.	Needham,	Stark,
Candler,	Kehoe,	Padgett,	Sutherland,
Cannon,	Kern,	Palmer,	Talbert,
Cassingham,	Lacey,	Pierce, Tenn.	Thompson,
Cochran,	Lever,	Randall, Tex.	Tirrell,
Cooper, Tex.	Lewis, Ga.	Reeder,	Underwood,
De Armond,	Little,	Reid,	Vandiver,
Dinsmore,	Lloyd,	Richardson, Tenn.	White,
Fox,	Loud,	Rixey,	Williams, Ill.
Glenn,	McCulloch,	Robb,	Williams, Miss.
Haskins,	McLain,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor.
Hay,	Mann,	Scarborough,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16.

Bartlett,	Deemer,	Ketcham,	Richardson, Ala.
Boreing,	Hall,	McClellan,	Russell,
Boutell,	Haugen,	Maddox,	Sherman,
Cowherd,	Irwin,	Pou,	Smith, H. C.

NOT VOTING—154.

Acheson,	Breazeale,	Cooney,	Elliott,
Adamson,	Bromwell,	Corliss,	Feely,
Alexander,	Broussard,	Creamer,	Finley,
Babcock,	Brown,	Crowley,	Fleming,
Ball, Tex.	Brundidge,	Cummings,	Fletcher,
Bankhead,	Bull,	Currier,	Flood,
Barney,	Burleigh,	Dahle,	Foerderer,
Bartholdt,	Burleson,	Davey, La.	Fordney,
Beidler,	Burton,	Davidson,	Foss,
Belmont,	Butler, Mo.	De Graffenreid,	Foster, Ill.
Benton,	Clark,	Dougherty,	Foster, Vt.
Blackburn,	Clayton,	Douglas,	Fowler,
Bowersock,	Connell,	Eddy,	Gaines, Tenn.
Brantley,	Conry,	Edwards,	Gardner, Mich.

Gilbert,	Landis,	Norton,	Smith, Iowa
Gill,	Lanham,	Otey,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Gillitt, Mass.	Lassiter,	Overstreet,	Snodgrass,
Gooch,	Lawrence,	Patterson, Pa.	Snook,
Green, Pa.	Lessler,	Patterson, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Greene, Mass.	Lewis, Pa.	Powers, Mass.	Stewart, N. J.
Griffith,	Livingston,	Pugsley,	Storm,
Griggs,	Loudenslager,	Ransdell, La.	Swanson,
Hanbury,	Lovering,	Reeves,	Tate,
Heatwole,	McAndrews,	Rhea, Va.	Taylor, Ala.
Hedge,	McCall,	Roberts,	Thayer,
Henry, Tex.	McCleary,	Robertson, La.	Thomas, N. C.
Hildebrant,	McRae,	Rucker,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Holliday,	Mahoney,	Ruppert,	Tompkins, Ohio
Hopkins,	Maynard,	Schirm,	Trimble,
Hull,	Mercer,	Scott,	Van Voorhis,
Jackson, Md.	Metcalfe,	Shackleford,	Vreeland,
Johnson,	Morgan,	Shattuc,	Wadsworth,
Joy,	Morrell,	Shelden,	Wheeler,
Kitchin, Claude	Moss,	Sheppard,	Wiley,
Kitchin, Wm. W.	Mudd,	Showalter,	Wilson,
Kleberg,	Mutchler,	Sims,	Wooten,
Kluttz,	Naphen,	Skiles,	Young,
Knox,	Neville,	Slayden,	
Kyle,	Newlands,	Smith, Ill.	

So the resolution was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. DENTON.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. McCLELLAN.

Mr. COOMBS with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. BULL with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEEMER with Mr. MUTCHLER.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

Until further notice:

Mr. METCALF with Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. BURTON with Mr. BALL of Texas.

Mr. LESSLER with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. COWHERD.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BELMONT.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. WOOTEN.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. CLARK.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. CLAYTON.

Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. HANBURY with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Until April 1:

Mr. JOY with Mr. MADDOX.

For balance of this week:

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

For one week:

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. HALL.

For this day:

Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. CONRY.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. COONEY.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. CREAMER.

Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. FLETCHER with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. GILL with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. HEDGE with Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. WILSON.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. TOMPKINS of New York with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. HULL with Mr. KLEBERG.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. KLUTTZ.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. NEWLANDS.

Mr. KYLE with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. MERCER with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. SCHIRM with Mr. NEVILLE.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. SKILES with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BREAZEALE.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. SHELDEN with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. SHATTUC with Mr. LANHAM.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. SNOOK.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. MCCLEARY with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCANDREWS.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MAHONEY.

Mr. DAHLE with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. FOERDERER with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. STORM with Mr. CUMMINGS.

On this vote:

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, for rule, with Mr. ADAMSON, against rule.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, in voting upon this proposition a few minutes ago, I did not recall the fact that I am paired with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER]. I am not perfectly sure how he would vote on this proposition if he were here, but I ask to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been announced as paired with the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I therefore wish to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

Mr. DEEMER. Mr. Speaker, I have been announced as paired with my colleague, Mr. MUTCHLER. As I have voted, I wish to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. HEPBURN. I believe it does not require a motion now to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. It is usual to make such a motion; but as the Chair finds the terms of the resolution are mandatory so that on its adoption the House must at once resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] does not want the House to go on now with the bill for more than a short time.

Mr. HEPBURN. Only a few moments.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. OLMSTED in the chair), and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. HEPBURN. The report in this case was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], to whom I yield the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall not this evening enter upon a discussion of the bill now under consideration. I simply want the attention of the committee for a very brief period to reply to what seems to me the unwarranted attack of the gentleman from Illinois upon the Secretary of the Treasury, present and past. The gentleman referred in his remarks in opposition to the adoption of the rule to the statute of October 2, 1888, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress at its next session a detailed statement of expenditures of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the fiscal year 1888 under the appropriation made therefor, and annually thereafter a detailed statement of the expenditures under each said appropriation shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

The gentleman from Illinois made the statement that the Secretary of the Treasury had deliberately, from the time of the enactment of that statute down to the present time, defied the mandate of Congress and had refused and neglected at any time to make the report required by that statute. In 1889, on the 2d day of March, that statute was modified so that it read that it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to submit the estimates for the Revenue-Cutter Service for the fiscal year 1891, and for each year thereafter, in detail, showing separately the amounts required for pay of officers, rations for officers, pay of crews, rations of crews,

fuel, repairs, outfits, ship chandlery, and for traveling and contingent expenses, etc. Now, the gentleman states that that report has never been submitted to Congress. The gentleman is absolutely and entirely in error, Mr. Chairman. The report has been submitted to Congress each year; is submitted this year in the Book of Estimates, and I read—

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Upon what basis does the gentleman say that the statute of 1888 which relates to detailed expenditures was modified by the statute of 1889 in referring to estimates for future expenditures?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, the two expenditures and estimates are governed by the same statute—by the two statutes the two are governed.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not claim that they are governed by the same statute?

Mr. SHERMAN. They are governed by the two statutes—the question of submitting a statement of the amount expended and of the estimates for the following year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it not true that the statute of 1888 required a detailed statement of expenditures?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. And that the statute of 1889 required a statement of estimates for future expenditures?

Mr. SHERMAN. It required a statement of estimates for future expenditures; correct.

Mr. MANN. Did not the statute of 1888 require a detailed statement of the expenditures already made?

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, I am getting to that; and in the Book of Estimates for the following year and for every year since, including the present year—it is found in the Book of Estimates this year on page 289—is included a statement of the amount appropriated during the last year and the amount estimated for the following year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman find that the estimates for this year is in the report purporting to show what the expenditures for the last year were?

Mr. SHERMAN. Why, certainly.

Mr. MANN. I would like to have them.

Mr. SHERMAN. The same book includes expenditures for the last year.

Mr. MANN. It gives the appropriation for last year.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. But not the expenditures.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, it gives appropriations for last year in this same book and the estimates for the following year. It is understood to be a compliance with the requirements of the statutes and is so stated in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will understand me that I have no desire to do injustice to the Revenue-Cutter Service—

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the gentleman has no desire either to do an injustice to the Secretary of the Treasury, but I think he has done so in stating the case. This Book of Estimates is intended by the Treasury Department and was considered to be a compliance with the statute and is, in my judgment, a substantial compliance with it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman himself claim that an estimate submitted for the coming year, which states what the appropriation was in the appropriation bill last year, is a compliance with a statute requiring a detailed statement of expenditures made by the Department?

Mr. SHERMAN. It shows the amount appropriated under each item specifically for the last year, and is a substantial compliance with the requirements of the statutes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I beg the gentleman's pardon; but, of course, it does not purport to show the expenditures of last year. Now, if the gentleman will permit me, at the same time of the passing of the statute in 1888 requiring a detailed statement of expenditures of Revenue-Cutter Service, provision was made for a detailed statement of the expenditures of the Smithsonian Institute, and that department makes to Congress an annual report, giving its detailed expenditures of that department. I have been unable to find, and I think the gentleman is unable to find, any detailed statement of expenditures at all. The only thing is the estimate.

Mr. SHERMAN. All I pretend to find is what is in the Book of Estimates, which shows the amount appropriated for last year and the estimates of the requirements for the various divisions of the Bureau for the following year, and it is, in my judgment, intended for, and is, a substantial compliance with the require-

ments of the statute of 1888 and 1889. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy any time to-night in discussing the merits of the bill. I will leave that for to-morrow morning. I did not wish to adjourn to-night until I had set right what I thought an injustice done the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I see here in the Book of Estimates for last year a statement showing amount appropriated under each head of appropriations \$1,400,000, and they give various amounts of appropriations, and I have been unable to find anything which purports to tell what the expenditures were, and if the gentleman can point out anything to that effect I will be glad to have him do so.

Mr. SHERMAN. It shows what the appropriations were for the several items of last year immediately following that.

Mr. MANN. Well, does the gentleman think that the Congress making the appropriation bill and then passing a law requiring the Department to show what the detailed expenses were would simply ask the Department to report back to Congress what the appropriation bill itself contained and say that was a compliance with the statute?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Treasury Department has understood during all these years that this was a substantial compliance with the statute, and it has so reported each year.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means that the Revenue-Cutter Service has made that contention. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. SHERMAN. I mean that the Treasury Department has. So far as we are concerned, so far as the estimates are concerned, so far as the statute is concerned, it refers to the Secretary of the Treasury and not to the Revenue-Cutter Service.

I move that the committee do now rise, Mr. Chairman.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2805. An act granting a pension to Mary Ella Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3103. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan Hays—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2971. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas D. Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1678. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Wingfield—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4319. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen G. Heiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2936. An act granting an increase of pension to Berthold Fernow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3472. An act granting an increase of pension to Zeno T. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1512. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Faulkner—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3519. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4072. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Lamden—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 493. An act to amend act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia."

S. 2305. An act granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Grove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4658. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Rand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. Res. 171. Joint resolution for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOLLIDAY, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEPBURN (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for an addition to Fort Taylor, Fla.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for pumping plant at Industrial Home School, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for continuing construction of military post at Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for forage, Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an agreement between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting documents and recommendations, with a memorial from certain commissions of the Creek tribe of Indians relative to a proposed agreement with the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War recommending an appropriation for the Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburgh, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1238); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3292) granting an increase of pension to Arthur H. Perkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1233); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7539) for the relief of Capt. Sidney F. Shaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1237); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SELBY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9219) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Newman, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1239); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10710) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Frances E. Scott, Jemison, Ala., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1240); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9952) granting an increase of pension to William P. Featherstone, of Owen County, Ky., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1241); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9777) for the relief of Helen F. Lasher, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1242); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the

bill of the House (H. R. 6699) granting an increase of pension to Esther A. C. Hardee, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1243); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11168) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Phipps, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1244); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9018) granting a pension to Ida M. Green, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1245); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11249) granting a pension to Katharine Rains Paul, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1246); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Moran, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1247); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1248) granting a pension to Erwin A. Burke, alias B. A. Erwin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1248); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12490) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Culbreath, late second lieutenant Company L, Palmetto Regiment South Carolina Volunteers, in war with Mexico, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1249); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12028) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Helphinstine, a veteran of the Mexican war, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1250); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12101) granting a pension to William E. Gray, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1251); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11550) granting an increase of pension to William G. Gray, of Burnsville, Miss., a veteran of the Indian war, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1252); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3743) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gurley Elderkin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1253); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9075) for the relief of Gustave Villouet, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1234); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6499) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernhard Reuter, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1235); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6022) to amend the military record of G. W. Rand, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1236); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11385) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Harris Hord—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12780) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wheeler—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 13072) applying the provisions of the mineral laws of the United States to the vacant lands in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 13073) to authorize the county of Maricopa, Ariz., to issue bonds for the construction of canals, and so forth, for irrigating purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 13074) to authorize the governor of the State of Mississippi to select certain lands in part satisfaction of its grant for university purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13075) to amend section 3 of the "Act further to prevent counterfeiting or manufacturing of dies, tools, or other implements used in manufacturing," and so forth, approved February 10, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 13076) to apportion the term of office of senators elected at the first general election in the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburg, Pa.—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Memorial of the Ohio legislature, in regard to pensions for Army nurses—to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 13077) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13078) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13079) to reimburse A. J. Cauffman, Girard, Erie County, Pa., in the sum of \$300, together with interest thereon from October 16, 1862, for soldier furnished United States, being the amount paid by him to one Charles Morton as a substitute—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 13080) granting a pension to William H. O'Dear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13081) granting an increase of pension to Anthony J. Railey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 13082) for the relief of the estate of Sven J. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRISTOW: A bill (H. R. 13083) granting a pension to Lockie W. Reeves—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13084) granting an increase of pension to John Middleton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13085) to confirm title to lot numbered 4, square 1113, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 13086) granting an increase of pension to Frances F. Hopkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 13087) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13088) granting an increase of pension to Hiram D. Deming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 13089) for relief of the heirs of Matthias Price, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 13090) granting a pension to F. S. Snodgrass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 13091) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13092) granting an increase of pension to Burdine Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 13093) granting a pension to Eliza A. Brownlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 13094) granting an increase of pension to John Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 13095) granting an increase of pension to Francis Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13096) granting a pension to James M. Hempill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13097) granting an increase of pension to H. H. McMichael—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13098) granting an increase of pension to James B. Mulky—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13099) granting a pension to Isaiah Waltman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13100) granting a pension to Louis Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13101) granting an increase of pension to Martin S. Wintzloff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13102) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13103) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Weimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13104) to remove charge of desertion from record of George Sloughman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13105) to remove charge of desertion from record of John L. Yohn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13106) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Zuleger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 13107) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 13108) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. S. W. Skinner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 13109) to provide the settlement of fire claims during the bubonic plague of the year 1900 of the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ZENOR (by request): A bill (H. R. 13110) for the relief of Joseph Bernard and other persons therein named—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 13111) granting a pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK: A bill (H. R. 13112) granting an increase of pension to Amos Wilson, chaplain Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Painters and Paper Hangers' Union No. 208, of Washington, Pa., concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolutions of Atlanta (Ga.) Division, No. 368, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of A. J. Cauffman, of Girard, Pa., for \$300 and interest from October 16, 1862, for soldier furnished the United States, being the amount paid by him for a substitute—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolution of the National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring the passage of a bill to remove the London landing charge imposed at the North Atlantic ports—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Gate City Division, No. 368, Atlanta, Ga., Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREING: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to William H. Odear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Resolutions of William H. Lytle Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and General George Washington Garrison, No. 1, in regard to personnel of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Polish Hall Alliance of the United States, favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue of the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, memorial of the National Live Stock Association, asking for the modification of section 4386 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of National Guard Association of Philadelphia, indorsing House bill 11654—to the Committee on the Militia.

Also, resolutions adopted by Utah volunteers, regarding mileage from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Dument Post, No.

258, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of South Dakota, for investigation of administration of Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BULL: Resolution of Typographical Union No. 33, of Providence, R. I., favoring an extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill 13085, to confirm title to lot 4, square 1113, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Resolutions of Subordinate Association No. 19, Lithographers' Protective Association of the United States, in opposition to the passage of House bill 5777—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Resolutions of Painters' Union No. 545, and Screwmen's Benevolent Association, of Port Arthur, Tex., and Trades and Labor Council of Palestine, Tex., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petition of Park Lodge, No. 555, Railroad Trainmen, Detroit, Mich., favoring restrictive immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Resolution of Harlem Board of Commerce, of New York, urging the appointment of more mail carriers in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Order of Railway Conductors of Pittsburg and Sunbury, Pa.; Locomotive Engineers of Oil City, Pa., and Railroad Trainmen of Reading and Hazleton, Pa., in regard to the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also resolutions of a mass meeting of the Utah Volunteers, favoring bill to allow travel pay from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco to those who enlisted on call for volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petitions of numerous citizens of West Virginia, favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Renovo, Pa., praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Renovo Lodge, No. 338, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Petition of Olive Leaf Lodge, No. 526, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, Stanberry, Mo., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill 3482, granting a pension to Jacob Hare, of Hancock County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Nail City Lodge, No. 110, of Wheeling; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Butchers' Union No. 7, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EVANS: Papers to accompany House bill 13091, granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of Polish-American citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GIBSON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Eliza A. Brownlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Petition of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., in favor of Senate bill 702, to establish a library post—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of the Hide and Leather Company of Seymour, Ind., for removal of the tariff on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James & Mayer Buggy Company, of Lawrenceburg, Ind., protesting against the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of citizens of Harpers Ferry, Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of House bill 9684—to the Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Papers to accompany House bill 7793, relative to the claim of Dr. A. Earle Boozer—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of Greene County,

N. Y., for the passage of a service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia: Resolutions of Atlantic Division, No. 368, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in favor of the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of a meeting of volunteers for the Spanish-American war, from Utah, asking for allowance of travel pay from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of John McCutcher Post, No. 154, Grand Army of the Republic, of Barry, Ill., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of John III Sobieski Society, of South Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Heart and Hand Lodge No. 505, of Fulton, Ill., and Muddy Lodge, No. 578, of Murphysboro, Ill., Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Boston Division, No. 122, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring an extension of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Theatrical Protective Union No. 59, Jersey City, N. J., favoring the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Jersey City, N. J., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of Bricklayers' Union No. 30, of Washington, Ind., favoring legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from the United States and insular possessions—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution of Painters' Union No. 226, of Chattanooga, Tenn., for the passage of laws which will prevent the immigration of persons who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORRELL: Memorial of National Live Stock Association, favoring modification of section 4386 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petition of Federated Trades Assembly of Duluth, Minn., in opposition to Senate bills 2054 and 1644, relating to electric wiring in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of Polish societies of Duluth and Virginia, Minn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Olmstead County Good Roads Association, Rochester, Minn., in favor of the good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petition of Cutters' Union of Newburyport, Mass., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Boston Division, No. 122, Order of Railway Conductors, favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Paper to accompany House bill 13107, granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petitions of Polish Societies of Milwaukee, Wis., by J. Bieganski and T. Czewinski, favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Retail Grocers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the passage of House bill 9352—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 9, of Milwaukee, Wis., regarding necessary experience required on shipboard to obtain a license as marine engineer—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of various branches of Polish National Alliances of Wilkesbarre, Dupont, Georgetown, Hudson, and Plymouth, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of General Hancock Circle, No. 9, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, Wilkesbarre, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Francis M. Brabham, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolution of Reno Post No. 4, Grand Army of the Republic,

Hagerstown, Md., favoring the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of Mary V. and Susan P. Keith, of Virginia, asking that their claim be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. S. W. Skinner, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Barnhart Bros. & Spindler, Chicago, Ill., and J. L. Mott Iron Works, of New York, favoring the creation of a department of commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON: Resolutions of Excelsior Lodge, No. 11, Phillipsburg, N. J., Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Resolutions of Polish National Society of Jackson, Mich., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 841, Carbondale, Ill., and of Carpenters' Union No. 939, of Campbell Hill, Ill., relative to settlement on public lands and reclaiming of arid lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution of Typographical Union No. 17, of New Orleans, La., in opposition to House bill 5777, amending the copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Eight-Hour League of America, in support of a national eight-hour day—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the National Guard Association of Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of House bill 11654—to the Committee on Militia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 28, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MISSOURI RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, ST. JOSEPH, MO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COCHRAN. I rise to ask for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, which is now privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the privileged resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 27).

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby instructed to send to the House of Representatives information as to the condition of river improvements heretofore constructed on the Missouri River at a point south of St. Joseph, Mo.; whether said improvements are incomplete and, on account of their incomplete condition, in danger of destruction; and the sum necessary to complete said improvements and prevent their destruction by the encroachments of the current.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to ask if this has been reported by a committee. It would not be privileged unless it is reported by a committee or unless the time prescribed by the rule has elapsed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution calling for information from one of the Departments of the Government. It has been in the hands of the committee for some time and not reported. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of it and that it be put upon its passage.

Mr. PAYNE. The question is, How long has it been before the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. More than a month.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to discharge the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from the further consideration of the resolution and to consider the same in the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution by striking out the word "concurrent" and inserting the word "House."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the word "concurrent" and insert the word "House," so that it will receive consideration as a House resolution. This will involve another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "concurrent" and insert "House."

In lines 1 and 2, after the word "Resolved," strike out the words "by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, is the resolution open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri to insert the word "requested" instead of "instructed." It will answer the same purpose, and will be the usual form.

Mr. COCHRAN. I make no objection to such a change.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the word "instructed" will be changed to "requested." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that he change the form of his resolution so that it will call for the information he has suggested with reference to all the improvements south of Sioux City, Iowa, rather than St. Joseph, Mo.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have the great honor to represent only a very small part of that vast territory, and I do not feel called upon to extend my jurisdiction.

Mr. MERCER. Will the gentleman accept an amendment of that sort?

Mr. COCHRAN. I prefer not to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the title will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

DUTIES PAID IN PORTO RICO.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11096) to refund the amount of duties paid in Porto Rico upon articles imported from the several States from April 11, 1899, to May 1, 1900, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment thereon, and making an appropriation therefor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States of all claims against the United States arising out of the payment of customs duties to the military authorities in the island of Porto Rico upon articles imported from the several States, which articles were entered at the several ports of entry in Porto Rico from and including April 11, 1899, to May 1, 1900, and the Court of Claims is empowered and directed to ascertain the amounts of such duties paid during said period and to enter judgment against the United States for the several amounts so paid, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the several dates of payment of such duties to the dates of such judgments, respectively, in all actions for the recovery of such duties now pending in the Court of Claims and in all actions for the recovery of such duties which may be brought in said court within six months from the date of the passage of this act.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the amendment of the committee amended by striking out all after the word "read."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend until consent has been given by the House. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman make some explanation of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, I want to say a word. This bill, in my judgment, should have gone to the Committee on Ways and Means, because it is a bill affecting the revenue, and I do not think that it gives the Committee on the Judiciary jurisdiction of the bill from the fact that it provides for a recovery in the Court of Claims. But the bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary before the Ways and Means Committee was aware that any such bill was before the House.

In the meantime the parties interested in this matter had appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and stated the facts in reference to these claims; and I think, so far as I know, the Committee on Ways and Means were not opposed to this refund of duty, duties paid in Porto Rico, which under the decision of the Supreme Court ought not to have been exacted. The bill provides also for the payment of interest. The parties would be entitled to interest if they could get jurisdiction of the collector, but the General Government has sent General Davis—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for order. It is impossible to hear what the gentleman says.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. PAYNE. The General Government has, as I said, in the meantime sent the collector, who was General Davis, of the